

**MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
MARCH 15, 2007**

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on MARCH 15, 2007 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:

David Jordan, Vice-Chairman	District 1
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
Sean Parks	At-Large Representative
Cindy Barrow	School Board Representative

Members Absent:

Staff Present:

Melanie Marsh, Assistant County Attorney
LeChea Parsons, Assistant County Attorney
Cindy Hall, County Manager
Gregg Welstead, Deputy County Manager
Carol Stricklin, AICP, Director, Growth Management
Brian Sheahan, AICP, Chief Planner, Planning & Community Design
Alfredo Massa, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Design
Francis Franco, Senior GIS Analyst, 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 Comprehensive Planning Division and that the meeting had been noticed pursuant to the Sunshine Statute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>AGENDA DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Changes to the Agenda	3
Sunnyside Policy & FLUM Review	6
Future Land Use Element Review	10
Rural Support	11

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Sean Parks updated the LPA on the Industrial Development Agency (IDA) meeting that he attended as their liaison and. He told the IDA that their comments were welcome.

Chairman Foley discussed a Best Management Practices (BMPs) pamphlet that was focused primarily on agriculture uses.

Peggy Belflower presented a copy of the Resolution text unanimously voted upon by the LPA, requesting each member sign it and that it be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) with a cover letter. Chairman Foley discussed the letter she had written to the BCC incorporating the LPA's resolution and addressing recent correspondence regarding the Montverde and Leesburg Joint Planning Areas (JPAs). Ms. Belflower said after consulting with the County Attorney's Office, it was determined the LPA could write and adopt resolutions.

Ms. Belflower said it was her perception that staff had indicated to the BCC that perhaps the LPA wants to take up the JPAs ahead of, in front of, or in lieu of working on the Comprehensive Plan. She said in response to a query about agenda items, she had requested the Leesburg JPA be placed on the agenda. She believed Leesburg had requested the County to act on their JPA and she wanted it to be clear with the BCC that it was not the LPAs intent to give JPAs priority over the Plan. Chairman Foley said the BCC had reviewed the letter and asked the LPA to proceed with reviewing land uses in the Leesburg area.

Ms. Belflower said Commissioner Cadwell stated in a letter to the LPA that the Montverde JPA boundaries would be addressed during a joint meeting with Montverde. She said that was not the truth and later they decided to delay adoption of all JPAs indefinitely. She commented that the JPA was not on the agenda and she felt the LPA had been told something that wasn't a fact. She wanted the LPA to be aware of the status of the JPAs and said after the Plan was completed that the LPA would be able work on the JPAs.

Keith Schue emphasized the importance of working with the municipalities on growth issues. He referred to an annexation issue relating to Montverde. Carol Stricklin, AICP, Director of Growth Management, said the annexation referred to by Mr. Schue involved Mascotte not Montverde. Mr. Schue discussed how annexations could affect the LPA's work in the absence of JPAs or annexation agreements. Mr. Kelly discussed the possibility of having urban growth boundaries.

Brian Sheahan, AICP, Chief Planner, noted that staff had presented the roadway map requested by Ms. Belflower and said the map books were also available.

Ms. Stricklin corrected her earlier statement about the Montverde annexation and said it had been on the consent agenda. She discussed some of the recent changes at the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and their meeting with their staff. She said they had discussed the status of the 2025 Plan, the Public Facilities Element and the

Ms. Belflower raised several questions regarding the consultant's qualifications in regards to the Smart Growth Audit. Ms. Stricklin said the Request for Proposal (RFP) had been issued pursuant to County procedures. Ms. Belflower asked why someone on the County's staff was not able to perform this audit instead of hiring outside consultants and asked why the LPA had not been informed of this audit. Ms. Stricklin said when the report was complete it would be provided to the LPA and that all County procedures had been followed. Ms. Belflower asked about the status of the audit. Mr. Schue thought the LPA should have been informed because this involved their work. Chairman Foley said she didn't have any problem with a review of the draft plan with regards to Smart Growth principles. Mr. Carey said the 2025 Plan would be subject to other reviews, such as financial feasibility. Mr. Parks remembered conversation about the Smart Growth Audit last summer. He said there wasn't enough County staff to conduct this audit because it is a large project, and these audits are supposed to be somewhat independent. Ms. Belflower objected to paying the consultant's fee and thought the audit could be detrimental to the wishes of the voters in the last election. She asked about the status of the work product and who would receive the audit. Ms. Stricklin said it would be presented to the BCC and the LPA as noted in her memorandum.

Mr. Kelly thought the bigger issue revolved around trust and perception. He questioned some of the consultant's documents because they were prepared by Akerman, Senterfitt P.A. and said a local land use attorney is part of that firm. He was concerned about creating more liability and undermining the efforts of the LPA. Ms. Barrow was concerned the audit could delay their work and requested access to the work product as it is done instead of waiting for a completed document. Ms. Belflower asked about the status of the four deliverables and the process to be used in the Smart Growth Audit. Ms. Stricklin said a copy of that process would be provided. Mr. Carey said in his experience of preparing evaluations for communities that he would never release an incomplete document because it can create serious problems. He said he would only release the work product when it was completed and then to all the parties at that time. Ms. Belflower said the contract states that all of the consultant's records pertaining to this contract are public record and are request-able by the County. Mr. Schue thought this would delay their project and integrating their work into the plan would take additional time. Ms. Stricklin said the Smart Growth Audit could be used at any point in the planning process, including the EAR review and that the results did not have to be used for transmittal. Chairman Foley noted it could apply to the LDRs process. Mr. Kelly alluded to a trust issue in the community if this audit changed the work of the LPA. Ms. Stricklin explained that staff works under the direction of the County Manager and they are staff to the BCC.

Ms. Belflower said that she still had questions on the grant application and said she found some errors in the application. She asked why the LPA was not notified during the process of grant application. Ms. Stricklin said the BCC authorizes grant applications and said she never thought this would become a contentious issue. She emphasized that if the County's grant application is funded, then at that time a detailed project description would be written and the County would have access to experts to assist with the LPAs work. She said the County's grant writers had completed the application. Ms.

Belflower objected that stakeholders such as the LPA and the Citizens Coalition had not been included. Ms. Stricklin said there had not been enough time to contact all the community groups and that the project process itself would include public participation. She said the LPA had not been viewed as an external stakeholder because it is part of County government. Chairman Foley said as an advisory board, the LPA and other County appointed boards or committees were part of the County government entity. Mr. Schue thought the grant appeared to be a process similar to rewriting the Comprehensive Plan and if this was part of the process, it should have been initiated when the LPA began their work on the Plan. There was general discussion about notifying the LPA regarding any grant applications. Mr. Carey said the LPA was behind schedule and said he had full faith in staff that there will be no eleventh hour surprises and said any conflicts will be addressed by the LPA. He encouraged the LPA to move forward.

Cindy Hall, County Manager, said she had supported both the Smart Growth Audit and the grant application. She thought independent analysis of the County's position on Smart Growth was important, whether or not that information was used. She said they want as much information as possible. She said normal County procedures had been followed. She said the LPA will be informed of any future applications. However, it would not be appropriate for the LPA to write the grant language and that would be done by the County's grant writers. She said the County had proceeded with every good intention.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Fred Cranmer discussed the importance of good communication, public perceptions and that he thought the LPA should have been notified of the grant application.

There was a short break and the meeting reconvened at 11:00 a.m. Sean Parks left the meeting during the break, David Jordan joined the meeting.

Mr. Sheahan said Eustis was not yet ready to make their land use comments and listed the other agenda items that could be addressed at this time.

SUNNYSIDE POLICY REVIEW

Mr. Schue discussed a map of land annexed since the original Sunnyside Task Force Study and thought these policies were over-complicating the Plan. He suggested a simple gradient of densities from north to south in the Sunnyside Task Force Study area, using the LPA's defined categories that most closely matched those in the Sunnyside policies. Chairman Foley suggested including Sunnyside in the Special Area section because these policies result from a public task force. Mr. Schue supported using the defined land uses. Mr. Sheahan said staff agreed and said staff supports removing unnecessary special land use categories. Mr. Schue reviewed his suggested text.

MOTION by Rob Kelly, SECONDED by Michael Carey to accept the Sunnyside Polices as presented by Keith Schue and to replace those land use categories with the closest mapping category in the 2025 Plan.

There was discussion regarding the chart of land uses, Mr. Sheahan said there had not been an opportunity for staff to review these suggestions. Mr. Kelly suggested moving forward with the motion and said if staff had comments they could be addressed at a later date.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Curry thought the table was confusing because the text completely explains the land use but the table text is worded differently. He suggested removing the table because it does not simplify the FLUM and making sure all the pertinent information from the table is included in the text.

Mr. Kelly and Mr. Schue agreed with Mr. Curry and Chairman Foley said she would add review of the table to their list.

FOR: Foley, Jordan Schue, Carey, Barrow, Belflower, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

Mr. Massa said staff would review the table and edit the text before bringing it back to the LPA for their review. Mr. Schue thought adding a list of maximum densities for each category would be helpful and presented a draft list. Mr. Kelly corrected Mr. Schue's draft list and said the Green Swamp Transitional category should be one dwelling unit per five acres.

MOTION by Keith Schue SECONDED by Rob Kelly to substitute the Summary of Residential Densities within Future Land Use categories in place of density table 1.2.5 with the correction regarding the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern (GSACSC) Transitional density.

FOR: Foley, Jordan, Schue, Carey, Barrow, Belflower, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

The LPA reviewed the language inserted by Mr. Sheahan and shown on the screen. Staff commented on the dedication of conservation easements in Policy 1-1.5.2 and noted that throughout the draft plan the term used is "approved governmental agency or non-governmental conservation agency." There was discussion about lot sizes, septic tanks and the economic feasibility of providing utilities. There was agreement to add "net" in front of density.

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Cindy Barrow to accept the Sunnyside text as shown on the screen.

FOR: Foley, Jordan, Schue, Carey, Barrow, Belflower, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks

AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

The LPA began review of the FLUM in the Sunnyside Taskforce area.

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Rob Kelly designate very low density to Rural Medium Density as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Belflower, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks, Barrow
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 7-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Rob Kelly to designate the highlighted R-1 zoning Rural Transition as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Belflower, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks, Barrow
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 7-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED Michael Carey to designate the highlighted R-1 zoning Low Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Belflower, Kelly, Barrow, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Cindy Barrow to designate the highlighted area as Low Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Michael Carey to designate the highlighted area Low Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Cindy Barrow to designate the highlighted area Low Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Peggy Belflower to designate the highlighted area Medium Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Cindy Barrow to designate the highlighted area Medium Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Vicki Zaneis to designate the highlighted area Low Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Jordan, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 8-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Cindy Barrow to designate the highlighted area Medium Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks, Jordan
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 7-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Rob Kelly to designate the highlighted area as Medium High Density as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks, Jordan
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 7-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Cindy Barrow to designate the highlighted area along Highway 441 Commercial and one parcel Public/Quasi-Public as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis
ABSENT: Parks, Jordan
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 7-0

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Cindy Barrow to designate the highlighted area Medium High Density Residential as depicted in Map Motion 1-13.

FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Belflower, Barrow, Kelly, Zaneis

ABSENT: Parks, Jordan
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 7-0

PUBLIC COMMENT

Fred Morrison, McIn and Burnsed P.A., said he represented Haines Creek Investments, L.L.C. and Snowbirdlands Vista Inc. which own Tara Mobile Village and Mid-Florida Lakes, both located on Highway 44. He distributed maps of these properties and said these developments have higher densities than would be allowed on the draft FLUM. He was concerned about these properties becoming nonconforming uses. He stated these properties were completely developed out, that these homes are more affordable and referenced Sec. 723.083, Florida Statutes.

Chairman Foley said the LPA had not addressed land uses in this area but said they would consider his comments. Mr. Schue agreed that the future land use assignment in that area should be different.

The meeting reconvened at 1:30 p.m. after a lunch break. Sean Parks left the meeting.

FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT REVIEW

The LPA proceeded to review Heavy and Light Industrial Use policies. Chairman Foley suggested including Concrete Product Manufacturing under Heavy Industrial. There was a consensus to include Light Manufacturing uses under Light Industry.

Mr. Kelly suggested Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) could be used to regulate things such as hours of operation. There was discussion about requiring a CUP for all Heavy Industrial Uses and designating areas for heavy industrial uses. Staff was concerned that a CUP requirement for all industrial uses could inhibit economic development. There was discussion about how to categorize uses by their characteristics, such as the use of raw materials and if the list was an example of uses or if it was a definitive list. Chairman Foley suggested adding "examples of uses are."

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Curry thought the difference between many of these categories was related to scale or whether a business was retail or wholesale. He said heavy industrial implies that there is a reason to segregate that use because it has some type of objectionable quality. He didn't believe the list of uses would be very helpful. He questioned how the CUP process for Heavy Industrial uses would be structured.

Mr. Schue suggested adding power plants to Heavy Industrial uses. He discussed the references to road access and railways. Staff agreed and said the text would be changed. Mr. Schue asked about the language regarding light industry as infill. Mr. Sheahan said that would be a compatibility issue.

There was a general consensus to ask the Industrial Development Agency (IDA) to review and comment on these policies. Mr. Kelly asked staff to discuss with the

County's Economic Development Director the possibility of controlling heavy industrial uses, possibly with CUPs, without inhibiting economic development.

There was agreement to change Policy 1.6.10, Protect Rural Lifestyle to an Objective at this time and to give further consideration to this issue.

The meeting reconvened at 2:25 p.m. after a short break.

RURAL SUPPORT

Wayne Bennett, AICP, Director of Planning and Community Design, said their last discussion left off with the question of embedding the Rural Support areas within rural areas or designating them. He discussed a map of the classified road locations in the County. There was some discussion about road classification.

Mr. Schue's proposal included the following:

- The vesting of existing commercial zonings.
- Locating rural support uses at intersections, with a limited number of rural support corridors.
- Recognition of designated rural support locations with an overlay.
- Inclusion of a limited amount of commercial in Rural Planned Unit Developments (PUDs).
- Each quadrant of a rural support intersection should have an allocation of commercial.
- Rural support corridors should be limited in length and width.
- Proximity to other rural support areas would be one of the criteria.
- No rural support would be located adjacent to public conservation lands.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Robert Curry said he reviewed rural support from the perspective of who would be harmed or who would benefit from these retail uses or services. He thought most of rural support would be either franchises or "mom and pop" businesses. He said comprehensive plan amendments would be too expensive and take too long for the small businesses. He suggested identifying appropriate intersections for rural support in the LDRs which are easier to amend and would make it easier to respond to changes in roads or other conditions. He thought requiring a CUP could further restrict those uses. Other things to consider are the intersections, lot size, building footprints, which quadrants and number of employees.

Lisa Aleman thought setting a maximum acreage could be detrimental to landowners. She said not all intersections are the same but said she could support controlling the building size.

Mr. Bennett suggested they focus on what they want to achieve. Because these are low density areas, policy should substantially limit where rural support can be located, whether that is done through criteria or mapping. He said Rural Support is intended to be in a few locations with few services and staff would like the policy as definitive as

possible. Mr. Bennett said definitions for the Rural Support zoning districts could be in the LDRs and the Plan should have policy delineating locations.

Mr. Schue said the overlay would give additional allowable uses. Mr. Kelly and Mr. Schue discussed the draft overlay policies.

Mr. Bennett said if commercial was located on both sides of a corridor then new houses could be located across from new commercial uses. Also, residential setbacks tend to be deeper in rural areas and this limit on commercial setbacks would move commercial in front of the normal residential pattern plus all parking would have to be located in front. Mr. Bennett said maintaining the development pattern would help to maintain the rural character. He said if corridors are used, then the depths should mirror the residential setbacks and said the average residential rural setbacks vary from road to road. There was discussion about the amount of square footage allowed. Mr. Bennett said unless commercial corridors terminate at intersections there will an adjacent landowner requesting the same land uses. He added that the length of the corridor would mean it would impact the front, back and sides. Mr. Schue said the existing zoning map shows rural commercial uses that are not located at intersections. Mr. Bennett suggested that those locations could be brought in as individual conforming locations by policy. Ms. Barrow asked if staff could provide alternatives addressing these concerns and asked about the setback issue. Mr. Bennett said some concerns could be addressed through buffering requirements. Ms. Foley said rural commercial corridors could increase the number of ingress and egress locations on rural roads. Mr. Schue said the corridor locations he had addressed were existing corridors. Ms. Foley thought the corridor policy could create more commercial uses. Mr. Bennett suggested that because the corridor is already in a community it could be a community node and limited to areas with established communities. Ms. Belflower did not think all of the listed commercial corridors were appropriate. Mr. Kelly and Mr. Schue discussed the square footage and Mr. Bennett said several questions were related to that, such as limiting square footage at each location or each building. He said there could be a 5,000 as a base, which can only be increased through a CUP. Mr. Schue said he envisioned two acre sites, four quadrants with an aggregate size of 7,500 on each corner. Ms. Foley said she would support only pre-existing commercial corridors. There was discussion that recognizing only intersections for rural support would limit the ability to add commercial uses to existing corridors.

David Jordan returned at 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Bennett suggested new nodes only at intersections with four full quadrants, eliminating T-intersections. He didn't believe an overlay was necessary if the use was embedded within the Rural Land Use category. Mr. Schue believed that criteria could allow too many locations. Mr. Bennett suggested using the three-mile limits and eliminating the T-intersections as the beginning basis for policy. He thought the policy should be criteria based or it should be a Future Land use category. Mr. Kelly was concerned about split zonings on a parcel. Mr. Schue thought if a future land use category was used, that there would have to be different categories corresponding to each

rural residential future land use. Mr. Sheahan thought they were using different meanings for the same terms. He said an overlay would allow commercial anywhere in that area and that can be done through embedding in policy. Mr. Bennett asked which uses the LPA thought were appropriate and then if the acreage limit would be applicable to all those uses or just commercial. He said the questions to be addressed were what belonged at those intersections, what is the footprint requirement and what is the acreage. Mr. Schue thought the same questions would have to be answered with an overlay or if the use was embedded. Mr. Bennett suggested limiting acreage size and including a maximum square footage for retail. Chairman Foley asked for consensus on topics such as 5,000 square feet maximum. Mr. Bennett said staff would review the potential number of locations.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Curry asked about the existing nonconforming businesses and would there be a way for them to evolve so they aren't put out of business. He also commented that lots located at these intersections may not be large enough to accommodate these uses and additional nonconforming lots could be created.

Mr. Schue thought the overlay would allow greater control. Mr. Kelly thought an overlay with criteria would be best. There was discussion on Ms. Belflower's question if nodes and overlays were the same. Mr. Sheahan said the 2025 Plan had an unusual number of overlays and said this issue could be addressed by putting the locations on a map or by embedding them through criteria. He said locations could be as strictly limited in text as in an overlay. Mr. Kelly said perhaps "criteria nodes" would work. There was discussion on geographically defined nodes with criteria. Chairman Foley said she would support putting them on the map. Ms. Zaneis thought over-defining things could prevent some nice things from happening. She thought setbacks should fit the type of business.

Lowrie Brown said he would address the LPA when they discussed the area containing his property.

David Ballew, Signature Homes of America, said he represented some land owners from south Lake County who would like to be able to develop their property at a higher density than currently designated for this area. He said the area to the north is developing at a much higher density.

Members of the LPA said the future land use on this property has remained the same and was consistent with Clermont's recommendation for this area of their JPA.

Lisa Aleman discussed the potential effects if the Rural Support criteria were applied to Howey because there is only one intersection that is not a T-intersection along Highway 19.

There was discussion on development and commercial uses in this area.

Pete Alverado, said he was representing the Bartletts, landowners of property on 452 just

north of Eustis. He asked when would be a good time to make a presentation to the LPA.

There was discussion that Eustis has not notified the LPA as to when they will have their land use recommendations ready for the LPA. Chairman Foley suggested a specific time be set to review the Eustis area.

Bill Ray, Boyer-Singelton, said he represented the Boyd David Trust, landowners in south Lake County. He described what he said was a mapping error from some time ago in the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern (GSACSC). He said the property was incorrectly displayed as white and consequently was designated Conservation. He said adjacent properties have higher densities. He said this land is high and dry. He suggested Transition land use, which would be consistent with the area.

Mr. Sheahan said Mr. Ray would have to create that parcel line. There was discussion on this issue between Mr. Kelly and Mr. Ray. Mr. Schue suggested reviewing as much of the original data as possible in order to make a decision. Mr. Kelly said zoning in that area was superseded by the GSACSC legislation. There was discussion on how to best resolve this and the basis for mapping these areas in the Green Swamp. Mr. Jordan said the decision of the LPA should be based on the available facts. Mr. Sheahan suggested Mr. Ray provide documentation for staff review and staff could then make a recommendation.

Mr. Ray said there is a second small parcel with a similar situation, there was agreement to apply the same resolution process to this parcel.

Chairman Foley explained that the next meeting was March 23, 2007 and the LPA would be addressing the Eustis area FLUM in the afternoon.

PUBLIC COMMENT

George Williams, a Howey area resident, asked when would be a good time for him to address his request to remove his property from the Rural Protection Area (RPA). He didn't feel his property was in a rural area any more as he can see sixteen houses from his front porch.

After some discussion, the LPA said they would review that area again and his request would be considered at that time. Mr. Sheahan described the current zoning and land uses on this property.

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

Donna R. Bohrer
Public Hearing Coordinator

Keith Schue
Secretary

