

**MINUTES  
LAKE COUNTY  
MT. PLYMOUTH-SORRENTO  
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**March 8, 2006**

The Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, March 8th, 2006, at 3:30 p.m. at the Sorrento Christian Center, 32441 CR 437N, Sorrento, Florida. The Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Advisory Committee is an advisory committee for continued planning efforts, within the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento area, as defined in Ordinance 2004-67.

**Members Present:**

Priscilla Bernardo Drugge, Vice-President  
Betty Ann Christian, Secretary

Minnie Bollar  
Jeanne Etter  
Dr. Ronald Homan  
Scott Taylor

**Members Absent:**

G. Curtis Duffield, President  
Tim Bailey  
Judy Weis  
Vacant Seats (2)

**Staff Present:**

Joan Greaney, Public Hearing Coordinator, Lake County Comprehensive Planning  
Quinette Durkin, Property Manager, Lake County Attorneys Office  
Shannon Suffron, Senior Planner, Lake County Comprehensive Planning  
Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, Lake County Planning & Zoning

**Guests:**

Commissioner Catherine Hanson, Lake County Board of County Commissioners  
Laura Knutson, Program Coordinator, Central Florida Sustainable Communities Initiative  
Keith Schue, Local Planning Agency member

Priscilla Drugge, Vice President, called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m., and noted that a

Quorum would be present at 4 p.m. when Dr. Ronald Holman arrived. No motions were made, or voting held, before that time. She confirmed that Proof of Publication was on file in the Planning and Development Services Division, and that the meeting had been noticed pursuant to the Sunshine Statute.

Betty Ann Christian disclosed that she spoke with Lou Fabrizio last week, and he was signing-up as a member of the Chamber of Commerce while she was there.

Priscilla recapped the recent presentation by the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Advisory Committee to the Local Planning Agency held on March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2006:

- A four-one approval
- Extremely positive feed back from the LPA.
- The LPA was pleased with and upheld the MPSAC.
  1. On coming together
  2. Putting forth their documents
  3. Models and examples for other Lake County areas to follow.
  4. Lou Fabrizio was present at the LPA meeting
    - a. Lou was objecting to a few items, as a representative of his company.

Keith Schue noted that it was a very positive day for Jean Etter, Priscilla Drugge, Betty Ann Christian; they did a good job representing the professionalism of the MPSAC.

Priscilla noted one odd comment made at the LPA meeting by Shannon Suffron, Lake County Senior Planner, questioning that the 30,000 sq feet was still up in the air. Priscilla's interpretation of what this committee had put forth was that there "was no discussion, 30,000 sq feet was it!"

- Email sent to every member of the MPSAC was referenced
- Handed out copies of the email to members

Priscilla stated that the last part of the email disturbed her. She read it into the record, starting on page two of the email: Laura Knutson commented to Shannon stating, ... "I suggested to Commissioner Hanson, that the developers in the Main Street District should work together in some kind of charette that the County requests. She liked the idea, and I think it could be the best way to have an integrated town center....."

Priscilla continued to read from Shannon's response to Laura....." Catherine (Hanson) did call me and we discussed the charette.....maybe we can make some folks feel better, not so scared about the numbers.....doesn't feel it should be limited only to 30,000.....should be allowed to go higher, to perhaps 50,000 square feet, if the developer agrees to meet certain performance criteria....."

Priscilla wanted an explanation from Commissioner Catherine Hanson, as well as from Shannon and Laura, as to these comments.

Commissioner Hanson offered her explanation.

- The Committee is making recommendations
- The LPA may, or may not agree
- They are looking for a visual appeal
- Not necessarily the size
- All about design
- Suggested the shopping center could be set back, with a street in the front
- Understood the Committee's passion
- Did not expect Lake County staff to be put on the spot
- Shannon and Laura are Planners and the Committee was not
- Committee submittals may not be what are approved
- Too much has been accomplished to criticize staff
- Commissioner Hanson said they may criticize her, but not the staff
- Staff has worked diligently for the Committee.

Commissioner Hanson had concerns in limiting the square footage of the Main Street Village.

- Mentioned the versatility of different facades
- May still keep the feel of a small town village
- What the Committee submits does not mean Board approval
- Approval is the option of the Board
- Counseled MPSAC that too much was accomplished to have it fall apart
- It was accomplished because of:
  - a. The Committee
  - b. The Community
  - c. Because of staff, and Laura (Knutson).
  - d. We need to listen to what they may, or may not be saying
  - e. We do have the right to question.

Priscilla noted that both staff and Laura had been invited to assist the Committee, but disagreed with Commissioner Hanson. Priscilla felt that it truly is about size.

Commissioner Hanson drew the meeting back, stating we were not here to argue, and reaffirmed that the Committee had stated many times what they would like to see in the Community.

Priscilla was disturbed by the fact that Lou Fabrizio is asking for 45,000 sq. feet.

Commissioner Hanson stated that she could understand that.

Priscilla said, Commissioner Hanson sat there and stated into previous minutes that she supported this Committee, and Priscilla was bothered by it. (email statement).

Commissioner Hanson noted:

- She has an even bigger responsibility
- Again stating that this is what had been submitted
- She respected it
- Publix in Gainesville had the facades earlier suggested
- They looked really nice.

Priscilla again stated that there was a misconception that Publix would not even entertain the idea of doing a 28,000 sq. foot store here.

- She called them, and spoke to Public representatives
- Representatives did not see why a 30,000 sq. foot grocery (Publix) could not be entertained there.

Scott Taylor added that the discussion of the 30,000 square feet has two pieces to it.

- One is the actual size, which is hard to comprehend, how big is big until it is actually built
- First concern – would new store represented a regional draw
  - a. Bringing people from far away, due to the fact that it was a more attractive draw
  - b. Cannot say is 30,000 sq feet terrific and whether 40,000 is better or worse
- Second major concern
  - a. How many people would be drawn in
  - b. How much would it increase the town traffic.

**Quorum present at 4 pm:**

Dr. Ronald Holman arrived at 4 pm, and a Quorum was now present for official business.

Jeanne Etter was recognized and stated:

- Hated putting the Commissioner Hanson on the spot
- Also disturbed by the email
- Asked the Commissioner point blank, did she still represent Mr. Lou Fabrizio?

Commissioner Hanson stated “No”.

- Current realty sign on his property was for a lease
- Noting, that this was not the issue at the table.

Jeanne noted an implication that the Commissioner was trying to get Mr. Fabrizio more footage, than was agreed to by the MPS Committee.

Commissioner Hanson responded:

- Did not say that she was trying to get him more than 30,000 sq. feet

- She was saying:  
What would be appropriate for the area?

Jeanne noted that at the December Charette, the Community was very vocal on what they wanted to see and not see out here.

- We did not feel that Canin was a fit here
- Felt there was an undermining current
- Noted a behind-the-scenes thing going on here
- Referenced the email; noting that maybe no one should have received it
- Email comments disturbed her
- She does not see the purpose of having another charette
- Would rather go on with policy
- It is clear what this Community wants here
- Again noted the positive response from the recent LPA meeting
- How the email had negated that positive feeling for her and Priscilla.

Laura clarified her responses:

- A workshop is what happened in December
  - a. Where they met with residents
  - b. Not called a Charette.
- A charette is something completely different
  - a. You sit down with the property owner- who has a program mix
  - b. You come up with an urban design, a landscape lay out.

Laura was sorry they got so upset, and there was so much confusion, but what was brought up in the email was not anything new.

- Referenced page 5 of minutes from the February 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting
- Noted what was referenced there was brought up at the last meeting
- It should not have been a surprise
- This was not anything new
- She had presented the graphic of the town center plan
- This effort was a coordination of three different property owners
- To eliminate working independently
- Not for maximum square footage
- Rather come together avoiding having developments happen in isolation
- The charette is not intended to undermine the committee's vision, but rather work to make it a reality.

Priscilla suggested a new process be used in creating the meeting agendas, so members would not be surprised.

Shannon noted, that they are not just created

- Staff was surprised with statement
- Always speaks with Curtis for his input

- Reviews the previous minutes in creating the agendas
- They are then sent to the Committee, and hand-outs are provided at each meeting.

Commissioner Hanson noted that at most meetings she attended, the Chairman sets the agendas, adding:

- The County is working on the Comprehensive Plan
- The amendments will be county wide
- The purpose of this Committee is to develop a Master Plan
- It would be an overlay to the Comp Plan
- Right now nothing can be put on that property list for commercial, until the Comp Plan is changed county wide
- We do not know right now what that will be
- We will have a Master Plan on top of that
- There will have to be a give and take as we go along
- Avoid locking in too tightly what we want
- We want the look and feel of the Village Concept.

Keith Schue added, that good policies have been created by the Committee

- In his perception, he felt there was a little bit of a tug-of-war
- There seemed to be an effort to convince the Community, that more is better
- He advised the Commissioner, that it was not appropriate to take an advocacy roll, for or against higher or lower square footage
- Stated, he was not passing judgment on anyone
- He felt that 30,000 was a product of a lot of discussions
- He felt the committee had found a middle ground for the box (grocery)

Commissioner Hanson directed that she would appreciate that the Committee did not get into individual properties.

Scott recalls that he had picked 30,000 square feet:

- It will be followed or not followed, as are all the other ideas sent to the Board
- Our objective is produce a quality product and stay on course
- He requested that they move on with the meeting.

Jeanne Etter asked for a correction on the True Village Center statement, as to the number 150,000, from the February 22nd minutes, on page 5.

Laura clarified her meaning and the wording; the correction would be made to the minutes of February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2006, as noted.

**MOTION by Priscilla Drugge, SECONDED by Jeanne Etter to approve minutes of February 22, 2006 minutes.**

**FOR: Bernardo-Drugge, Bailey, Bollar, Christian, Etter, Holman, Taylor,**

**ABSENT: Duffield, Weiss, Bailey**

**AGAINST: None**

Betty Ann Christian gave the Committee the proper procedure to be followed for member applications, submittal of names, and the handling of resignations.

- No action would be taken on member vacancies
- There is a longer route to take by working with the BCC
- Working through the system.

Shannon made a recommendation to hold one meeting per month

- Until further notice
- Did not feel that more meetings would accomplish anything at this point
- Assured members, that they could return to two meetings a month, when they begin work on the LDRs (Land Development Regulations).

Commissioner Hanson stated that she was comfortable at where they were.

Laura explained a proposed mini charette

- To get something together with all the policies they have set out
- What that would begin to look like
- Find a delicate balance for developers to feel comfortable volunteering to submit to this process
- To have their vision represented
- Spend a Saturday, to get something with all the policies set out, and what

that would begin to look like

- Then begin to develop the LDR's from there.

Laura stated that they need to determine who to invite to this charette.

- The developers at the table right now, in the box, so they will come voluntarily
- What mix from the Committee
- The property owners in that box
- What would they all feel comfortable with
- Elect one representative from the Committee
- Developers bring their plans, and staff would come
- It would be a working meeting.

Priscilla and Jeanne felt that everyone on the Committee needed to be represented.

Shannon advised, that everyone come to the table.

- Put policies and proposals on paper, into words
- Create a concrete idea
- What it will look like
- Establish the guidelines
- Thus developing an overall master plan to work with.

Priscilla doesn't feel comfortable with the proposal, getting everyone gathered to put it all together. Sees it as an opportunity for someone to come into the charettes, and drive their project right through.

Betty Ann questioned:

- How many developers would be invited
- If we agree to the charettes
- We need to have everyone that is invited to show up
- Someone needs to coordinate their showing up.

Laura put forth, two, possibly three developers ( third - Jones property).

Shannon directed that having developers come:

- Stating their plans
- The Committee stating the rules
- Results in a much better product.

Keith noted that the following was critical

- Number one, what possibilities exist based on what has been agreed upon by the committee
- The framework is based on the Comprehensive Plan policies

- Do not step outside what those policies state
- Secondly, the size of the charette area (Main Street District) is important
- Know the area we are talking about, that Main Street core
- Third, open disclosure
- Who is attending the charette, and what interest do they represent
- Have full participation by everyone in the room.

Scott doesn't feel how they cannot do this charette.

- To not take what we have worked on to date
- To not expose it to real property owners; some who may already have plans on paper
- We need to get comments from those people
- How do they feel about what we are trying to put together
- Number two, the Committee has an opportunity from an economic point of view
- What is going to make this town tick
- We need to test the waters
- It does not mean we are making any decisions or sacrificing anything
- Just making decisions with multiple points of view
- It is important to have this kind of thing (charette).

Jeanne, we live here and we are trying to protect our area, not criticize anyone, but trying to protect ourselves.

Priscilla made a suggestion for the charette

- As long as everyone was invited
- It was held according to Sunshine laws
- Advertised accordingly.

Shannon suggested April 29<sup>th</sup> and noted, she would work on a location, as well as begin getting ready for the charette; get invitations and notifications out when the charette is set, also have a screen and projector at the charettes, per staff request.

Priscilla requested that the members receive copies of the proposed Comp Plan policies that were recommended, prior to the charette. Shannon agreed they should have those.

Shannon again suggested, the motion for one meeting per month.

**MOTION by Priscilla Drugge, SECONDED by Betty Ann Christain to have one**

meeting per month, with the next meeting on Wednesday, April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

**FOR:** Bernardo-Drugge, Bailey, Bollar, Christian, Etter,  
Holman, Taylor,

**ABSENT:** Duffield, Weiss, Bailey

**AGAINST:** None

Employment Center will be on next agenda, as Mark Reggentin of Mt. Dora was not present at this meeting.

Shannon presented pictures of two trees located on State Road 46, and noted an email of February 2006, sent from the Department of Transportation to Fred Schneider.

- Recommending removal of these two (2) trees
- Stump grinding within 12 inches below ground
- Trees cause visibility problems
- Resulting in traffic accidents with some fatalities
- Tree on the right is in the MPS area
- Tree on the left side is Mt. Dora jurisdiction
- DOT needed a response by next Friday
- Without a response, DOT will take them anyway
- But if you want to respond, do so
- The Committee agreed with their removal
- Scott noted safety came first.

Dr. Holman recommended replacements be put in, the Committee agreed. Live oak trees, about 12 to 14 feet, were proposed as replacements.

Shannon will take the committee's comments back to them, and write the letter.

Shannon told the members about the presentation to the Board of County Commissioners on March 28<sup>th</sup> in Chambers, and if they were going to attend, she reminded them of the Sunshine Law notification requirements.

**Foot Note:** The following paragraph will cover the attendance of MPSAC at this meeting and is always included in all ads to cover these attendances.

Mary Harris, Public Hearing Coordinator in Lake County Planning and Development Services, ran the ad for the March 18th, 2006, Board of County Commissioners transmittal

of proposed petitions, and the notice reads in part: "...one or more members of different committees or boards, may be in attendance, and may participate in discussions on any of the committee, or board meetings noticed in this ad."

Shannon requested, if the Committee had any items they wanted on future meeting agendas, then email herself, or Joan.

Public Comments:

Leslie Garvis asked if the public would be allowed to sit and listen? Shannon said it would be advertised, and the public was always welcome.

Lou Fabrizio wanted to set the record straight. This goes on the record, Catherine Hanson has never represented Lou Fabrizio, but rather an agent earned a commission for a transaction, and that agent represented the property owner; she did not represent Lou Fabrizio. I have never talked to Catherine Hanson about a transaction. He did not feel that it was fair to make accusations that Catherine would have something to gain by his development. He stated, that he did not feel it was fair to make a statement that people who do not live in the area, did not care what happened in the community, or that his opinion was not valid. Lou stated this was not true, we are making the investment. We are willing to work with you. I attend every meeting, and no one has ever asked me, my opinion. We want something that will be in the community for a long time. We are willing to bend and work in partnership with the community.

Dr. Holman pointed out that Lou was willing to talk with our local grocery stores here, and that he was working in that regard also. Stating how they appreciated that.

Shannon asked if everyone, to include the public as well:

- Would please write a paragraph on Historic Sorrento
- What does that mean to you
- What would it look like
- What are the characteristics of it? Keep the flavor, keep the character
- What does that look like
- What do you mean when you say "Historic Sorrento?"
- Bring that to Shannon before the April 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, you can email her
- Any pictures as well
- Put the look into words especially.

Keith addressed Mr. Fabrizio's comments, regarding what a member of the Local Planning Agency had said.

- The LPA welcomed comments, and considered all comments
- Keith clarified that David Jordan expressed his view point - that the people who live in the community have the most at stake

- Keith said that he did not disagree with that statement.

The Employment Center will be on next agenda, as Mark Reggentin of Mt. Dora was not present at this meeting.

Priscilla asked for any further comments, none were heard. She adjourned the meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

---

Joan M. Greaney  
Public Hearing Coordinator

---

Betty Ann Christian  
Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><u>AGENDA ITEM:</u></b>	<b><u>AGENDA DESCRIPTION</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NO.</u></b>
1	Submittal of names for Tommy Hight's replacement	
2	Discussion of the Employment Center	
3	New business	
4	Old business-MPSAC status report to BCC & Charette	
5	Minutes of February 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2006	