ACTION LIST
9/08/08

	ITEM	Date Added	Completion Date
	Astor community commercial development corridor along SR40.	2/21/08	2/21/08
	Dona Vista area between Umatilla and Eustis (C-2) Zoning but does not meet commercial location criteria. Existing development is primarily commercial (Staff)	2/21/08	3/4/08
	Final definitions list and abbreviations list (Provided 3/6/08 rev. 3/14/08)	2/6/08	3/14/08
	Policy 1.4.1.3 Functional Areas. Review number of dwelling units that will trigger Traditional Neighborhood requirements.	2/6/08	3/14/08
	Policy 1.4.8 Regional Office FLU. Discuss as to Light Manufacturing in the Office category: Should we make it a conditional use rather than non-conditional use as it is now.	2/6/08	3/14/08
	Policy 1.4.10 Light Industrial FLU. Discuss to add limited affiliated retail in light industrial; an example: A wholesale cleaning supplies company that delivers its product would also want to offer it retail in its showroom.	2/6/08	3/14/08
	Policy 7.1.3 Aviation and Rails. These policies are redundant with those contained in the Transportation Element Obj. 1.8 and 1.9 and should be deleted.	2/21/08	3/14/08
	Objective 1.4 Readdress the heights in the Thresholds for Intensity and Impervious Surface Ratio.	2/6/08	3/14/08
	Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial need to include allowance for commercial and office uses supporting the primary industrial applications. This has been referred to as "accessory" commercial and office uses. Industrial sites normally contain and allow such supporting businesses in close proximity to the industrial uses, and omission of such would make Lake County industrial sites undesirable. The following Policy entitled "Allocation and Compatibility of Industrial Land Uses" would also have to be modified to allow for accessory uses. The first sentence currently proscribes them for Heavy Industrial.	2/6/08	3/14/08
	Add policy "Lake County values art in the built environment, in both public and private areas and finds that art be included as an option within landscaping. (Request through Commissioner Stivender from Arts & Cultural Alliance in memo dated 2/28/08 to BCC) [Staff draft to LPA 3/14/08]	3/6/08	3/14/08
	Map Exhibit List needs to be revised to include Transportation Network and Trails (Conservation is duplicated)	3/13/08	3/14/08
	Add policy "grandfathering" existing commercial not meeting commercial location criteria. [Draft Policy to LPA 3/14/08]	2/21/08	3/20/08
	Objective 1.2 Future Land Use add Employment to bullets	3/13/08	3/27/08
	Objective 7.2 Review Policies regarding rural protection areas (Discussed 4/17/08)	3/14/08	4/17/08
	Add Policy to Goal 4.0 regarding implementing LDR's for dark sky in green swamp. (4/17/08)	3/14/08	4/17/08
	Policy 1.4.10 Review Heavy industrial uses that require CUP's	3/14/08	4/17/08

	Policy 1.4.12.5 Review Commercial corridor in Astor	3/14/08	4/17/08
	Objective 7.10 Review Community Enhancement Area Overlay District	3/14/08	4/17/08
	Modify Mt. Plymouth Policies to reduce stories to two.	5/15/08	5/15/08
	Policy 7.1.9 Review Allow for Neighborhood Commercial Uses	3/14/08	6/19/08
	Policy 7.4.1 Agricultural Primacy (page 132).	6/19/08	6/19/08
	Objective 1.4 Review Commercial uses in urban land use series. Intensity related to land use category…	3/14/08	6/26/08
	Objective 1.4 Review Intensities in urban land use categories	3/14/08	6/26/08
	Policy 1.2.3 Review Densities for lot splits and family lot splits not to exceed allowable Future Land Category density.	3/14/08	6/26/08
	Policy 7.6.1 Review Sunset Policy	3/14/08	6/26/08
	Policy 7.4.2 Review Ag. Land Retention Study policy timeframe for initiation	3/14/08	6/26/08
	Policy 1.2.2 (page 10) Consistency between Future Land Use and Zoning -- the last phrase of the paragraph needs some rewording for clarification, now reads as follows: "or when a proposed use is not within a zoning district allowed with the existing future land use category."	6/19/08	6/30/06
	Add SR 40 scenic road to Objective/Policy 6.3	3/14/08	completed
	On this same page and the next, where it says "City of Lady Lake," this should be changed to "Town of Lady Lake."	6/19/08	6/19/08
1	Policy 1.2.1 Future Land Use Map Series. The LPA needs to see/review all exhibits prior to transmittal.	2/6/08	
2	Policy 3.2.4 Point System Rating Criteria - Wekiva (also Green Swamp?). Discussion regarding the Point System and particularly the item below k. on page 1-59: "If it can be demonstrated . . . "	2/6/08	
3	Objective 7.11.1 Adopt Joint Planning Areas. Review and discuss due to the BCC leaning towards inter-local service areas and not JPAs. [Combine with Item 21]	2/6/08	
4	Lake Apopka basin water and wastewater standards. (Objective 6.4) needs specific threshold for service. Discussed 3/27/08	3/13/08	
5	Emeralda Marsh Policies relating to Open Space	3/13/08	
6	Goal 3.0 Wekiva Goal reorganization and consistency with ORC	3/13/08	
7	Joint Planning Area Policies to consider Interlocal Service Agreements (also Smart Growth Strategy) Discussed on 3/20/08 and 3/27/08	3/13/08	
8	Revise Policy 1.1.1 Innovative Planning Techniques	3/13/08	
9	Objective 1.3 Rural Land Use Categories clarification of text (KS - need to revisit 4/17/08)	3/13/08	
10	Commercial Corridor intensity and Commercial Centers, additional Commercial Corridor type (Discussed 3/20/08 Staff to bring back)	3/13/08	
11	Wetland and water body protection (as it relates platting)	3/13/08	
12	Policy 7.5.2 Inventory Antiquated Plats, Parcels of Record – Revise to delete 2nd sentence	3/13/08	

13	Objective 6.2 Historic Overlay District – Revise	3/13/08	
14	Goal 1.0 Organization of the Future Land Use Categories		
15	Policy 1.4.8 Review Regional Commercial Land Use Category	3/14/08	
16	Objective 4.2 Review Airports in the Green Swamp as defined by 9J-5.003(4) F.A.C. (Staff to draft policies)	3/14/08	
17	Policy 7.6.1 Review PUD requirement over a certain number of units in a development.	3/14/08	
18	Goal 5.0 Review Emeralda Marsh Protection Area	3/14/08	
19	Policy 7.5.4 Review Existing Lot Exception for density	3/14/08	
20	Objective 7.7 Review Developments of Regional Impact	3/14/08	
21	Policy 7.14.6 Review Standards for Amending the Comprehensive Plan	3/14/08	
22	Policy 7.1.5 Review Affordable Housing Incentives	3/14/08	
23	General edits throughout the plan	3/14/08	
24	Airtrip and airpark policies (Staff & Rob Kelly to draft)	3/14/08	
25	Revisit Denisity and Intensity calculations in Policies 1.2.3 thru 1.2.5	3/20/08	
26	Commercial Location/Commercial FLUC provisions to address appropriate standards for commercial development	3/20/08	
27	Mining Uses	4/17/08	
28	Mining Uses (discussed on 6/30/08, 7/10/08 Policy 7.3.7) Staff (Water Resources) to bring back definitions of Mining, excavation and borrow pits.	6/30/08	
29	Landfills	4/17/08	
30	School policy requiring dedication of lands (Discussed but no motion)	4/17/08	
31	School siting policies are repetative	5/22/08	
32	1.3.4 and 1.3.5 (pages 13 - 15), Rural Low and Rural Medium Future Land Use Categories -- Uses, and Uses requiring a conditional use permit). If you read the school location criteria, (see page 142 - 143, -- 7.9.4 and 7.9.5), it seems clear to me that large schools of 60 acres do not belong in the low or medium rural land use series. There are many reasons that our schools should move toward walkable locations within our more urban neighborhoods. Large rural schools (with huge parking lots) will spawn continuing rural sprawl and should only be a <u>last resort</u>. These schools cost the taxpayers a lot of extra money in many different ways and can also have a significant negative impact upon children and families. Have we not already had some conflicts about high school locations in Lake County? If we will not consider disallowing large schools in these land use categories, how about considering the requirement of a Conditional Use Permit? There should at least be public comment before large schools are allowed within Rural Low or Rural Medium. Such a process could also benefit the School Board in the longer run. (Discuss when Cindy Barrow returns on July 6)	6/19/08	

33	7.1.5 Affordable Housing (pages 124 - 125). The 08/09 SHIP program document uses the following http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/affordablehousing.htm terminology: " extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households and to households with special housing needs." The reference to "extremely low" and also "moderate," appears to have been added this year, which is perhaps why I have been consistently exposed to this terminology and some members of staff have not. HUD uses these terms too, and to help you understand them, "extremely low" is below 30% of what is determined by HUD to be the median income for a given municipality. "Very low" is 31% - 50%, "moderate" is 51% - 80% of the median, and over 80% is considered "non-low moderate."	6/19/08	6/30/08 (Except definition)
34	Policy 7.2.6 Rural Roadways (page 129). Suggest changing the last words of the second sentence from "as two-travel lanes." to "as two-lane travel."	6/19/08	
35	Policy 7.2.7 Protection of Natural Resources (page 129). First sentence currently reads as follows: "The County shall continue to provide for low-impact development within Rural Future Land Use Series, WRPA and GSACSC.,and as appropriate shall encourage the use of Conservation Subdivision techniques at rural densities in order to enhance the protection of common open space, rural viewscapes, and wildlife corridors." Suggest changing as follows: "Development within the Rural Future Land Use Series, WRPA and GSACSC shall be low-impact, appropriate, and shall encourage (would prefer "require" above a certain threshold) the use of Conservation Subdivision techniques at rural densities in order to enhance the protection of common open space, rural viewscapes, and wildlife corridors."	6/19/08	
36	Policy 7.3.3 Protect Floodplains (page 131) The second bullet states: "Prohibit land filling and grade changes where such activity will cause erosion or inhibit flood waters." Would it be advisable to expand this policy or add another? There are low areas, sinks, and dips throughout the portion of the County where I live. Most all of them were made by nature, not man, and each has a purpose. I believe that it is time for Lake County to have more sophisticated policies about filling, grading, etc. Could we consider an additional policy for the Comp Plan that says something like the following: Policy _____, Land Disturbance Plan and Implementation Requirements. Within 12 months (insert standard language) the LDR's shall be expanded to address land disturbance activities, including at a minimum, guidelines and regulations concerning grading, filling, stockpiles, elevation changes, runoff, erosion, sediment control, dust control, filling and burial or burning of debris. On a daily basis I am disheartened to witness the continual filling (and the wisdom of building atop some of these artificially created spaces is questionable, as is what this does to recharge and water quality), with various kinds of debris, of low-lying and sink areas. In addition, vast acreage of bare hillsides are and will continue to be bare for significant periods of time due to development expansion that is not being phased. (Discussed on 6/26 and 6/30 - Vicki Zaneis to suggest definition.)	6/19/08	

37	Policy 7.3.4 Protect Wetlands and Implement Wetland Classification Program (page 131). Though we discussed this policy, I was not left with a sense that we had entirely agreed to what is in the fourth bullet: "Depending on wetland significance provide for development flexibility through mitigation/compensation measures where more beneficial environmental results may be achieved." I am not a big fan of wetland mitigation (which has largely been ineffective) and feel that each type of wetland is important in its own special way and in the location where it exists. To me the "less important" wetlands are very important to the ecosystems of the area in which they are located. There are times when what is stated here could be appropriate, but to me such "mitigation" should very seldom happen, and should not become a routine practice. Questions of concern to me also, are by whom and how the "more beneficial environmental results" would be determined. Also, this Policy states "Within 12 months . . . the County shall implement a wetlands classification program". I recall that we discussed classifying all of the wetlands in the County. Is that what we are saying will happen? If so, who will do this, at what cost, and according to what guidelines? I am in favor of us doing this, but have some concerns about the magnitude and cost of the task, and the legality of what might happen if we do not accomplish this as stated?	6/19/08	
38	Policy 7.5.1 -- second bullet reads: Is determined to be inconsistent with the character of the surrounding community." This gives me some angst because I can imagine businesses that have been long-standing and wonderful assets that have always been welcome in their location by their neighbors (even if somewhat non-conforming), but the scenario changes when urban growth surrounds the business. Should our Comp Plan facilitate squeezing out any of these special assets?	6/19/08	
39	Policy 7.6.1 (page 138) The first bullet reads: "A PD's density and intensity shall not exceed the density and intensity of the underlying Future Land Use Categories and may be further restricted in the Land Development Regulations." Suggest adding the word "overall" as the third word in the prior sentence. Four bullets later we have a bullet that states "PD zoning shall be required for any application seeking to increase density and proposing 50 or more dwelling units." Doesn't this bullet conflict with the first bullet?	6/19/08	
40	Policy 7.10.1 Action Plan Guiding Principles (page 143). The third bullet reads: "Partnerships <u>with groups</u> that could include neighborhood groups and associations, the business community, outside organizations and County government; and" Suggest striking the highlighted words "with groups"	6/19/08	
41	Objective 7.11 Intergovernmental Coordination (page 145) First sentence reads: "The County shall coordinate with other local governments and agencies to <u>facilitate</u> consistent facility and land use plans, to provide cost-effective services, to maintain compatible land uses, and to ensure coordination of resource planning and management plans. Due to the repetition, facilitate seems the wrong word here -- how about replacing with "enable", "encourage," "accomplish," or "foster"?	6/19/08	
42	Policy 4.5.11 Prohibition of New Mines in the GSACSC Discussion	7/10/08	