MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
JANUARY 17, 2008

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on JANUARY 17, 2008 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 and the Land Development Regulations.

Members Present:

Rob Kelly	District 2
Michael F. Carey	District 3
Peggy Belflower	District 4
Nadine Foley, Chairman	District 5
Keith Schue, Secretary	At-Large Representative
Vicki Zaneis	At-Large Representative
Vacant	At-Large Representative

Members Absent:

David Jordan, Vice-Chairman	District 1
Cindy Barrow	School Board Representative

Staff Present:

LeChea Parson, Assistant County Attorney
Brian Sheahan, AICP, Planning & Community Design Director
Grant Wenrick, Landscape Architect, Planning & Community Design
Donna Bohrer, Public Hearing Coordinator, Planning & Community Design

Nadine Foley, 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 Planning and Community Design Division and that the meeting had been noticed pursuant to the Sunshine Statute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGENDA DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
Landscape Ordinance	3

The LPA scheduled additional meeting dates for the month February.

PUBLIC COMMENT

George Corbett thanked the LPA for this opportunity to discuss property owned by his family in the vicinity of U.S. Highway 27 and the Turnpike. He discussed their land plan amendment application for a community commercial center, which had resulted in a small area study and the County's approval. He noted that a hold had been placed on their application and several others by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). He thought this issue could be resolved during the drafting of the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and requested the Regional Commercial Future Land Use Category (FLUC). He identified the property on the draft FLUM shown on the screen. There was discussion regarding the uses allowed in the Regional Office FLUC. Mr. Corbett agreed with the Regional Office FLUC and to exclude the wetlands acreage.

Chairman Foley said although the FLUM would not be reviewed at this meeting, they would consider Mr. Corbett's request.

Rob Kelly discussed the recent meeting of the South Lake Chamber Economic Development Subcommittee and said they would be discussing their recommendations with the LPA at an upcoming meeting. He said the topics of discussion included road capacity issues, the availability of infrastructure and how approved developments could provide economic growth.

The LPA discussed the economic presentation made by the County's consultants to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). Some issues discussed were: the over-dependence on residential construction; the need for a well-trained workforce, the importance of open space; directing growth to urban areas; the amount of area approved for economic growth; the importance of arts/cultural events; proactively seeking out businesses; being business-friendly and building on the viability of the County's downtown areas.

LANDSCAPE ORDINANCE

Grant Wenrick, Landscape Architect, Planning & Community Design, discussed additional draft language regarding landscaping issues along right-of-ways raised at yesterday's meeting. There was a consensus of the LPA with the draft language in Item 7 as shown on the screen.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jon Pospisil suggested requiring fencing in all subdivisions with homes that back up to external roadways.

There was a consensus of the LPA to remove Items 11 and 12.

Keith Schue suggested requiring a Type "A" buffer between Agriculture uses and R-1 through R-7 residential zonings except when equivalent vegetation was provided by the

agricultural use. Mr. Sheahan said staff would not recommend requiring this buffer because of the many variables and said there could be safety concerns regarding vegetation used to buffer livestock areas.

MOTION by Rob Kelly, SECONDED by Keith Schue that zonings R-1 through R-7 would be required to have buffer Type "A" when adjacent to Agricultural zoning.

Mr. Sheahan thought this requirement could generate considerable public opposition. Ms. Belflower said she would like this to be applicable to new subdivisions. Mr. Sheahan said this would apply to anyone developing property and Mr. Kelly suggested setting a number of units as a threshold. Mr. Sheahan said this was a very complex issue and suggested this issue be addressed at a later time.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Jon Pospisil said he was concerned about basing this requirement on zoning categories because land zoned R-1 may be developed at one dwelling unit per five acres and this could require a buffer between two pastures. He suggested using the R-3 zoning as the threshold or using a different requirement.

Mr. Schue agreed that compatibility concerns were created by the actual density and said that was an issue with the Landscape Buffer Table.

FOR: **Schue, Belflower, Kelly**
ABSENT: **Jordan, Barrow**
AGAINST: **Foley, Carey, Zaneis**
MOTION FAILED: 3-3

The meeting reconvened at 10:55 a.m. after a short break.

Mr. Schue was concerned that allowing landscape buffers on private lots could create enforcement issues. There was discussion if buffering was necessary between equivalent residential uses. Mr. Wenrick suggested buffers be a separate tract in larger developments, but in smaller developments, buffers could be in easements. He thought requiring a separate tract for less intense or smaller developments could be an undue burden. There was agreement to delete #10, but retain the requirement in the chart so buffers could be an easement or separate tract. Mr. Sheahan suggested modifying it to say the landscape buffer shall be a separate tract or easement maintained by the home owners association (HOA). Mr. Schue thought that was the same thing he had objected to because he didn't believe easements on private property would be enforceable. There was a consensus of the LPA with Mr. Sheahan's suggestion that in subdivisions of ten (10) lots or greater, the buffer shall be in a separate tract.

Mr. Wenrick said it was still Public Works' position that street trees should be located at least ten (10) feet away from the right-of-way (ROW) because of maintenance concerns. Mr. Kelly said he hoped the distance limit could be based on the sidewalk instead of the ROW. Mr. Sheahan said the County would be responsible for maintenance of

landscaping in county-maintained ROWs, and said landscaping within the ROW was allowed provided the landowner assumes that responsibility.

There was consensus of the LPA with the edited language for Item 14 shown on the screen.

The LPA discussed the responsibility for installation of the buffer; if the buffer should be provided by the most intense use or by the first development and if individual homeowners or residential developments should be included. The LPA agreed to delete Item 1.

The LPA discussed Item 14 and agreed upon the language shown on the screen.

In Item 17, the LPA discussed ornamental tree spacing, increasing the number of trees and allowing enough space for the tree canopies.

There was discussion about requiring a landscape bond or withholding certificates of occupancy until landscaping was installed. Mr. Sheahan said staff would review the parking graphics and text for consistency. The LPA reached consensus on minor changes to language. There was discussion on reducing the amount of sod around residential areas and a consensus to require that 35% of the first floor footprint shall be non-turf. After Ms. Zaneis commented that the draft language would in effect penalize multi-family developments with more units, the LPA reached a consensus to combine multi-family developments with the single-family residential.

There was discussion regarding the schedule for the next meeting.

The Chair continued the meeting to January 24, 2008 at 12:40 p.m.

Donna R. Bohrer Public Hearing Coordinator	Keith Schue Secretary