

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

May 14, 2008

The Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, MAY 14, 2008 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 2008-08.

Members Present:

G. Curtis Duffield, President	
Priscilla Bernardo-Drugge, Vice-President	
Jeanne Etter	Dr. Ronald Holman
Vacant	Judy Weis
Leslie E. Garvis	

Members Absent:

None

Staff Present:

Dottie Keedy, Economic Growth & Redevelopment Director
Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney
Karen Ginsberg, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Design
Rick Hartenstein, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Design
Ross Pluta, Engineer III, Public Works
Donna Bohrer, Public Hearing Coordinator, Planning & Community Design

Guests:

Keith Schue, Local Planning Agency member
Peggy Belflower, Local Planning Agency member

G. Curtis Duffield, President called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and noted that there was a Quorum present. He confirmed that Proof of Publication was on file in the Planning and Community Design Division and that the meeting had been noticed pursuant to the Sunshine Statute.

MOTION by Jeanne Etter to approve the minutes from April 9, 2008 as submitted.

Leslie Garvis thought the language on page 2 implied the committee had discussed the list of topics. Priscilla Bernardo suggested editing it to read “discussed pursuing the following.”

MOTION AMENDED by Jeanne Etter, SECONDED by Priscilla Bernardo to approve the April 9, 2008 as amended.

FOR: Duffield, Bernardo, Etter, Garvis

ABSENT: Holman, Weis

AGAINST: None

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Judy Weis and Dr. Holman arrived after this vote was taken.

President Duffield noted that Rick Hartenstein, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Design, would no longer be assisting this committee and on their behalf he thanked Mr. Hartenstein for all of his assistance.

PROPOSED SIDEWALK ORDINANCE

Karen Ginsberg, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Design, noted that the committee had been e-mailed the County’s current sidewalk ordinance. She said Ross Pluta, Engineer III, Public Works, was present to answer questions regarding the feasibility of sidewalks in this area.

Mr. Pluta said generally one of the difficulties with sidewalk installation in developed areas was insufficient right-of-way (ROW). He said during the construction of subdivisions and other developments the County may require additional ROW from the developers. He suggested including a requirement in their regulations that sufficient ROW should be available for sidewalk construction and maintenance. He said ROW space was also used for drainage areas and paved road shoulders.

Jeanne Etter said cities are requiring additional ROW from developers for sidewalks and she would like to discuss sidewalks in the Main Street Corridor. Ms. Ginsberg said the Department of Transportation (DOT) did not have a representative available for this meeting. She said Mr. Pluta was here to present general information and to discuss sidewalk planning and construction. Mr. Pluta said DOT had not been very encouraging about the feasibility of sidewalks along SR 46 because of the lack of adequate ROW. He said another possibility would be to put sidewalks on private property in which case DOT would not be responsible for maintenance or liability. Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney, said sidewalks on private property are the responsibility of the property owners. She noted that because SR 46 is a state road, the County has no jurisdiction. She said requiring the dedication of land for sidewalks can be

difficult because the courts have taken the position that requirements for sidewalks must be proportional to the impact of that development.

Priscilla Bernardo said they needed to have DOT turn SR 46 over to the County. Don Griffey, Griffey Engineering, said he did not think DOT would turn SR 46 over to the County, until or unless the bypass was built. He said DOT considers SR 46 to be a rural road and therefore those are the design standards they apply to this area. He suggested it might be best in this situation to get DOT to consider this section of SR 46 an urban roadway. Ms. Garvis said she believed this was a rural area. Mr. Griffey said the term referred to the design standards for the road. Ms. Bernardo agreed and said they would have to convince DOT that this section of SR 46 should be considered an urban area. Mr. Griffey suggested having the Lake/Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (L/SMPO) and the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) make recommendation to DOT.

Ms. Bernardo noted for the record that Mr. Schue had raised his hand to request an opportunity to address the committee. President Duffield said there was a committee member that still had a question to ask. Ms. Etter asked Mr. Griffey if it would be appropriate for the citizen's committee of the MPO to request this change in design standard classification for SR 46. Mr. Griffey said he thought it would be better if the request originated from this committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Keith Schue suggested the reclassification include the stipulation that the road remain two (2) lanes with no turn lanes.

Peggy Belflower said she thought the MPO had offered to complete a traffic study for SR 46. Chairman Duffield said there had been a motion at the last meeting. Ms. Garvis said they had been told there was no funding for that study and that it would take two (2) years.

MOTION by Priscilla Bernardo, SECONDED by Dr. Holman to request the Lake/Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (L/SMPO) request that SR 46 be designated a maximum two (2) lane cross-section roadway.

MOTION amended by Priscilla Bernardo to add "urban" to the motion.

Ms. Garvis said she was not comfortable with the term urban. Ms. Etter said it referred to the design standards and asked if she would prefer language relating to "urban design standards."

MOTION restated to read: to request that SR 46 remain a maximum two (2) travel lane roadway/cross-section road utilizing Urban Design Standards.

FOR: Duffield, Bernardo, Etter, Garvis, Holman, Weis

ABSENT: None

AGAINST: None

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

Ms. Ginsberg said she would see if a representative from the MPO would be available for the next meeting.

Dottie Keedy, Director of Economic Growth and Redevelopment, suggested the committee visit communities that had developed compatible to the vision for this area. She added that they could visit with those planners and to review their policies. The committee noted that many members had visited other communities and there was agreement to review the policies of those communities.

There was discussion regarding future meeting locations. Dr. Holman said he would contact the pastor of the church regarding scheduling availability.

After a brief discussion the June community workshop meeting was scheduled for June 17, 2008.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Holman referred to MPSPAC Policy 1.1.4 policy suggested regulating building height by number of feet instead of stories. There was discussion with some members preferring a limit of two (2) stories. Ms. Ginsberg said the height could be limited to a specific number of floors with a percentage of that allowed for the roof.

There was discussion if these issues should be addressed through the community's design standards or in the Comprehensive Plan policies or the Land Development Regulations (LDRs). Mr. Schue suggested setting the limit at 40 feet in the Comprehensive Plan policies without a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Some members were concerned about requiring landowners to obtain a Comprehensive Plan amendment. There was discussion about using height or number of stories to control the height of buildings.

MOTION by Dr. Holman, SECONDED by Priscilla Bernardo to amend Policy 1.1.4, item 7 of the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Policies to set a maximum building height of 2 habitable stories not to exceed 40 feet with varied roof lines.

FOR: Duffield, Bernardo, Etter, Garvis, Holman, Weis

ABSENT: None

AGAINST: None

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

Dr. Holman said he would like to discuss the 30,000 square foot commercial limitation in Policy 6. He said since those policies had been developed he had learned more about the business world. He thought the market square and the main street district should be separate issues. He was concerned about the possibility of a bunch of strip malls and he thought they should focus on a small

central core without allowing it to grow exponentially. Ms. Bernardo said at one point the committee had almost agreed on three commercial nodes, with one walk-able complex and residential uses in between. President Duffield said it was the Canin & Associates presentation that showed build-out all along that area, because they did not believe the three (3) areas would be walk-able. Ms. Etter said she did not want to change the 30,000 foot size limitation. She supported including that limitation in the Comprehensive Plan policies so it was very difficult to change. She thought this should be discussed further and that they should not be rushed into voting. Dr. Holman was concerned that the building size be adequate to be economically feasible. He suggested there could be one commercial location and then a decision could be made on the building size. Ms. Bernardo thought there should be defined commercial areas with professional/residential uses between those areas. She thought that was consistent with the original study and with the community's input. Mr. Hartenstein suggested they could consider retaining the commercial corridor, define the center district as the market square with a total aggregate footage and let the market determine the size. Judy Weis asked if percentages of uses could be prescribed outside the market square and staff said that would be difficult to track. Mr. Schue discussed some of the problems using aggregate limitations at intersections and developing regulations to reflect the community's character. There was discussion regarding an appropriate size for the market square. Ms. Bernardo asked if staff could determine the size of the downtown areas of some of the local communities to assist the committee with defining the appropriate size of the market square. The committee agreed to review the maps with these questions in mind and to discuss the market square concept later.

Ms. Ginsberg asked which County staffers they would like to have at the community meeting in June. There was agreement to invite Harry Fix, AICP, Lake County School Board, and T.J. Fish, AICP, Executive Director, L/SMPO. There was agreement that topics should include a progress report including the requested traffic study, an update on schools and an emphasis that the market square is still a goal.

MOTION by Dr. Homan, SECONDED by Jeanne Etter to adjourn the meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:33 p.m.

Donna R. Bohrer
Public Hearing Coordinator

Jeanne Etter
Secretary