

**MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY**

JUNE 16, 2005

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 2005 at 9:02 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.

Members Present:

David Jordan	District 1
Michael F. Carey	District 3
Richard Dunkel	District 4
Nadine Foley, Vice-Chairman	District 5
Keith Schue, Secretary	At-Large Representative
Barbara Newman, Chairman	At-Large Representative

Members Absent:

Sean Parks	At-Large Representative
Ann Dupee	District 2
Becky Elswick	School Board Representative

Staff Present:

Gregg Welstead, Deputy County Manager; Director, Growth Management Department
Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney
Amye King, AICP, Planning Manager, Comprehensive Planning Division
Jeff Richardson, AICP, Planning Manager, Planning & Development Services Division
Kitty Cooper, Director, Geographic Information Services Division
Terrie Diesbourg, Director, Customer Service Division
Alfredo Massa, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Amelyn Regis, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Shannon Suffron, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Francis Franco, Senior GIS Analyst, Comprehensive Planning Division
Thomas Wheeler, Comprehensive Planning Intern
Fred Schneider, Engineering Director, Public Works
Greg Mihalic, Director, Economic Development & Tourism
Donna Bohrer, Office Associate III, Planning & Development Services Division

Barbara Newman, 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 ITEM:</u>	<u>AGENDA DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
a	Comments and Availability for Questions, Chairman Carl Lunderstat, Industrial Development Agency	4
b	Discussion of Provisions for Changes to Section 10.02.00 and 10.05.00 of the Land Development Regulations	5
c	AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING CHAPTER II, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS ENTITLED DEFINITIONS; REMOVING THE REFERENCE TO LARGE POLE SIGNS FROM THE DEFINITION; AMENDING SECTION 11.01.03(15) LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, REMOVING THE REFERENCE TO BILLBOARDS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.	6
a	Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Update: Goals and Objectives	8

Industrial Development Agency

Amye King, Planning Manager Comprehensive Planning Division, introduced Carl Lunderstat, Chairman of the Industrial Development Authority (IDA) and Greg Mihalic, Director of Economic Development and Tourism.

Mr. Lunderstat explained the IDA had worked to bring high paying jobs with benefits to Lake County. He said the Chris Ford Commerce Park is at capacity and it will eventually provide four thousand jobs. Although the average wage has increased in Lake County it still is below that of some of the adjacent counties.

Mr. Lunderstat said the IDA has created a sub-committee to review the Economic Element. He would like to see the County create a pure business park to attract higher paying professions. He said the IDA was looking forward to the new economic element and the potential for the County to partner in a business park.

Nadine Foley if asked there was a specific type of property to consider for economic development and how did traffic issues impact economic development. Mr. Lunderstat said the IDA wanted space available for economic development and acknowledge that the infrastructure is in place to support it.

In response to Keith Schue's comments, Mr. Lunderstat said it was important to have sites ready and available for relocating businesses. He said the IDA hoped to be able to make "concrete recommendations" on the Economic Element.

Mr. Schue said the turnpike corridor in south Lake County has real potential for commerce and business. He added that future transportation projects elsewhere in the county could also have economic benefits. Mr. Lunderstat said the IDA believes that location is market driven. He emphasized the importance of a good employee base. He said a subsidy consisting of land or infrastructure might be needed, or the county could be the anchor tenant in a business park.

Mr. Lunderstat said the Job Growth Investment Trust Fund would be focusing on three employment areas, industrial, professional and the disabled. Their current focus is on the disabled sector and they are rethinking their strategy on that issue.

Richard Dunkel asked if they had targeted specific industries or technologies to attract. Mr. Lunderstat said everyone wants high-tech jobs, but he questioned that Lake County had the highly skilled work force necessary to support those jobs. The IDA has attracted distribution and light industry and although those are "higher paying" they are not highly skilled jobs. At this point, incentives are only offered to industries paying 115% of the County's mean wage.

David Jordan asked if the IDA had information to help ensure the Economic Development Element would support their objectives. Mr. Lunderstat thought the incentive program should continue to be objective and remain non-contentious. The IDA

would like to take a creative approach. He thought there was an opportunity to attract high-tech jobs, with work force development and if infrastructure was available. Mr. Jordan agreed on the importance of an objective incentive program to retain the public's trust and thought the county should stimulate economic growth. Mr. Lunderstat thought it might be necessary for the county to "anchor" a business park to ensure it's success.

Michael Carey arrived at 9:35.

Nadine Foley asked what types of industries were considered to be high tech. Mr. Jordan thought it was the knowledge worker versus the industrial worker. Mr. Lunderstat considered it to be a career requiring a college degree, but the real difference was the salary. Ms. Foley wanted to avoid as much economic instability as possible. Mr. Lunderstat said the high tech sector was safer for the environment and it would be better from a tax point.

In response to Mr. Schue, Mr. Lunderstat explained that medical research facilities are generally associated with a university. He added that businesses tend to relocate wherever the corporate executive officer would like to live.

The LPA thanked Mr. Lunderstat for all his hard work. Mr. Lunderstat said the IDA is very conscious of their responsibility to the public.

Mr. Mihalic reminded the LPA that the Comprehensive Plan Elements interact with each other and it was important to have a pro-business approach in all of the elements.

Land Development Regulations Section 10.02.00 and 10.05.00

Terrie Diesbourg, Director, Customer Service Division, said approval of this request would allow the temporary use of a single-wide mobile home during home construction and for care of the infirm, terminally ill or disabled person. She said all the other requirements remain the same.

In response to Mr. Schue, Ms. Diesbourg explained this change had been initiated by the County Attorney's Office. Sanford Minkoff, County Attorney said if a mobile home is called a "single family dwelling", then a minimum width requirement of 24 feet would apply, which prohibits single-wide mobile homes for these specific uses.

MOTION by David Jordan, SECONDED by Michael Carey to approve the changes to Section 10.02.00 and 10.05.00, of the Land Development Regulations as presented by staff.

FOR: Newman, Foley, Schue, Carey, Jordan, Dunkel

ABSENT: Parks, Dupee, Elswick

AGAINST: None

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING CHAPTER II, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS ENTITLED DEFINITIONS; REMOVING THE REFERENCE TO LARGE POLE SIGNS FROM THE DEFINITION; AMENDING SECTION 11.01.03(15) LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, REMOVING THE REFERENCE TO BILLBOARDS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Terrie Diesbourg, Director Customer Service Division, explained the current wording of the Land Development Regulations (LDR) made it difficult to enforce the prohibition of all off-site signs. This proposed change would make it clear that all off-site signs are prohibited. Ms. Diesbourg added that in a recent Board of Adjustment (BOA) hearing the current wording was construed to allow an off-site sign.

Amye King, Planning Manager, said Becky Elswick had sent an e-mail to be read in her absence. In that e-mail Ms. Elswick asked that bench signs be prohibited.

Sandford A. Minkoff, County Attorney, referred to a decision by the Eleventh Circuit Court that invalidated a sign code because it contained several exemptions one of which was bus bench signs. He said sign code cases are the First Amendment cases and are subject to frequent judicial review. The Florida Association of County Attorneys will be writing a model sign code. He thought the county's sign code would be rewritten at that time. He anticipated the new code would be "content neutral" and would withstand any First Amendment challenges.

In response to Mr. Jordan, Mr. Minkoff said the zoning of the property would define what signs were allowed. He added the County has already had some bench signs removed and was not issuing permits for them.

Mr. Schue said in this case the issue was whether the signs should be allowed. Mr. Schue said if his reading of the ordinance was correct then billboards are prohibited, Ms. Diesbourg agreed. She said the ones currently in the county were pre-existing when the sign code was enacted. Mr. Minkoff added that under Federal Law, the county could have the billboards removed, however the cost may be prohibitive.

In response to a question from Chairman Newman, Ms. Diesbourg said bench signs were included under exempt signs. Mr. Minkoff said they intended to remove all exempt signs from the code. Although the bench sign issue was not pertinent to this ordinance, Mr. Minkoff suggested the LPA share their opinion with Mr. Welstead.

Nadine Foley said if the bench signs were "off premise" then wouldn't they be included

in this ordinance. Mr. Minkoff said the current code exempts these signs. Mr. Schue said that he thought the confusion was when the location of the sign serves another use. Mr. Minkoff added there had been a problem with political signs placed on tractor trailers.

Ms. Foley and Mr. Schue commented that the use of stationary railroad cars as signs could also be an issue.

Ms. Diesbourg said she would like to incorporate “in use” with “common carrier” in the ordinance although that wording was not advertised. Mr. Jordan said the difference was vehicles that were moving as opposed to those parked. Mr. Minkoff understood Ms. Diesbourg’s position, however, he believed that wording would be un-workable and enforcement would be difficult.

Mr. Minkoff said a complete revision of the sign code would be presented for the LPA’s review in the next few months.

Mr. Jordan asked about political signs. Mr. Minkoff said the courts had struck down a sign code because it contained more liberal rules for political signs. He believed the court would not uphold codes regulating signs, based on the type of speech or message.

In response to a comment made by Mr. Schue, Mr. Minkoff said the only exception to the prohibition regulating sign content upheld by the Court was on billboard signs.

MOTION by David Jordan, SECONDED by Michael Carey to approve the changes to CHAPTER II, APPENDIX E, of the Land Development Regulations as presented by staff.

FOR: Newman, Foley, Schue, Carey, Jordan,

ABSENT: Parks, Dunkel, Dupee, Elswick

AGAINST: None

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

For the record there was no public comment on this ordinance or the preceding one.

There was a 5-minute break.

Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives

Amye King, Planning Manager said transportation would be discussed first and she said Fred Schneider, Engineering Director was available to answer questions.

Amelyn Regis briefly reviewed the goals of the Transportation Element, she added that the Level of Service (LOS) would be addressed at a later date.

Ms. Foley provided updated information to staff on the Umatilla Airport.

In response to a question from Mr. Carey, Ms. King said the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) would be responsible for coordinating with the airports. Mr. Minkoff added that the MPO would be assuming some of the county's responsibilities. Mr. Carey was concerned about the impact of airports on their surrounding areas. Ms. King explained the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) has guidelines for flight paths, approach zones and other impacts to surrounding developments. Those FAA regulations require local governments to coordinate land uses in the vicinity of airports. Mr. Minkoff said there was airport zoning currently included in the Land Development Regulations (LDR).

Mr. Schue asked if the Transportation Element would consolidate Traffic Circulation, Mass Transit and Airport together. Ms. Regis said separate elements had been required prior to the formation of the MPO. Mr. Schue thought including subtitles would be helpful and that similar statements could be consolidated. He said that he thought that Objectives 1.6 and 1.7 could be consolidated.

Mr. Schue made editorial suggestions to remove what he felt was the subjectiveness in the second sentence of Objective 1.2.

Mr. Schue read his suggested text for an environmental impact objective in the Transportation Element. He was concerned that future traffic improvements not adversely impact environmentally sensitive areas.

Mr. Schue thought the objective titled TRA 2.9 would be more appropriate in the Future Land Use Element (FLUE). If it remains in the Transportation Element he offered a suggested text.

Richard Dunkel thought scenic highways should be addressed in this element. Ms. Regis said it was included in the more recent drafts.

Ms. King suggested the LPA give a consensus approval to their suggested changes to the elements. It was agreed that the LPA concurred with the suggestions made this morning. Chairman Newman asked LPA members to provide staff with written suggestions to avoid miscommunications, she reminded members to make their comments before meetings whenever possible.

David Jordan referred to a statement about County funding for the Leesburg Airport. Mr. Welstead said he would check on it. Mr. Welstead said the County could only offer comments on any plans for the Leesburg Airport.

Bob Curry, a resident of Lake County, reiterated his concern that water transportation be included. He asked about canal dredging to facilitate inter-lake transportation. Ms. King said some of those issues were covered in the Recreation Element or the Conservation Element. In addition, the MPO would be considering freight uses on the waterways in their Long Range Transportation Plan. That plan would be incorporated into the county's Transportation Element.

Mr. Schue and Ms. King agreed that transportation corridors in the County were limited by the number of lakes.

In response to a question from Ms. King, the LPA recommended that Blueways be cross referenced in both the Transportation and Recreation Elements.

Mr. Curry stated that he was concerned about lake access. Mr. Dunkel said those issues could be tied to the trail system. There could be enhancement funds available for trailheads and portage points.

Blanche Hardy, Director Environmental Services said there are designated navigatable waterways that will be included in the Comprehensive Plan. The US Coast Guard and the Army Corp of Engineers designates those waterways. She cautioned that waterway transportation should be carefully defined and there should be no conflict with the regulations of either federal agency.

Ms. Foley thought the best agency to address that issue would be the MPO. Ms. King reiterated that the Comprehensive Plan and the MPOs Long Range Transportation Plan must be consistent with each other.

Public Facilities

Shannon Suffron, Senior Planner explained there are 5 sub-elements included within Public Facilities.

After comparing this draft with the current plan Mr. Schue questioned the absence of hazardous waste. Blanche Hardy said there was a very recent rewrite with significant differences from this draft. Ms. Hardy said the County's Public Safety Department, the individual cities and the Department of Environmental Services (DEP) were all involved with hazardous materials and emergency response. Ms. Hardy said a list of cities with emergency response capabilities would be included in the new Comprehensive Plan. She added that since September 2001 many of these responsibilities have been shifted to other agencies.

Mr. Dunkel said some funding had been shifted to Public Safety departments. Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney, said when the optional Public Safety Element is reviewed these issues would be addressed.

David Jordan said this sub-element referred to the disposal of solid waste, not to any emergency situations.

Mr. Schue agreed that accident management would belong in the Public Safety Element.

Sanitary Sewer/Potable Water

Ms. King said the most important issue was availability and requested this topic be reserved until later.

Aquifer Recharge

Mr. Dunkel would like to see a goal set forth to limit water use in plant nurseries. Ms. Hardy stated that the State and the Water Management Districts are requiring everyone with a Consumptive Use Permit (CUP) to reduce their water consumption. For example the Wekiva legislation is requiring local governments to consider alternative water sources. The required Master Storm Water Plan will be included within the comprehensive plans of local governments.

Nadine Foley said some counties do not issue well permits for plant nurseries. They are required to use only rainwater. She said re-circulating water also helps to trap nutrients on site. Ms. Hardy said the State is not issuing water permits for Agriculture use without attaching special requirements. Ms. Foley suggested referencing the Lakes Soil and Water Conservation District in this element.

Ms. King said Ms. Hardy is an expert on Aquifer Recharge and would be able to answer their questions.

In response to a question from Mr. Jordan, there was a brief discussion about water use by nurseries. Ms. Hardy said CUPs are not being issued without conservation plans and plans to reduce water use. Mr. Jordan thought it should be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Dunkel said he would like to address existing permits, not just new ones. Ms. Hardy cautioned that such an effort must be coordinated with the State.

Mr. Schue said the focus should be on minimizing the draw down of the aquifer. He acknowledged that water reuse is a good thing, however they should also remember that reuse water does not recharge the aquifer. He suggested including the nursery issue in the Potable Water Element, the LPA agreed by consensus.

Mr. Carey was concerned about the effect of some storm water plans on individual

homeowners in subdivisions. He said there was only a sign-off by an engineer stating the subdivision had been built to conform to the approved design plan. He said there is no follow-up inspection on the grading. Ms. Hardy said that was not supposed to happen. It is difficult to inspect every site and the County is aware of the issue. Mr. Carey thought that at least a cursory inspection could be done.

Fred Schneider, Director of Engineering, said mass grading by developers is inspected by Public Works. He thought the alteration on individual home sites by the builders could have an adverse effect the storm water plan. Public Works has added an additional review of lot grade during the design review.

He said there would be a draft of Chapter 9 of the LDRs submitted after the adoption of the new comprehensive plan.

Mr. Jordan said that SJRWMD review and regulations did not apply until water use reached a certain level. Ms. Hardy said most well users were also on septic tanks and added that good septic tank is really a recharge vessel. She said irrigation also recharges the aquifer.

There was discussion regarding which element(s) would include information on septic tanks.

Mr. Schue suggested the following wording for the first goal “ to maintain adequate quantity and quality of aquifer recharge, protect potable water supply and ensure the protection of natural systems”. There was a consensus to accept this wording.

Mr. Schue said in Objective 1.1 he would like the addition of “and ensure the protection of natural systems, including springs and wetlands”. There was agreement to accept this wording.

Mr. Schue suggested an additional objective “Lake County shall prohibit the construction of Rapid Infiltration Basins (RIBs) within primary recharge areas in the Wekiva Study Area in order to limit nitrogen transport to the aquifer”. Ms. Hardy suggested adding “unless they can demonstrate otherwise” or “unless they propose to use that for tertiary”. The LPA agreed with the addition of “consistent with DEP”. Ms. King suggested the wording be applicable to all primary recharge areas. Ms. Foley suggested Conserve II staff be consulted to ascertain if the existing RIBs are in a primary recharge area. There was discussion between Mr. Schue and Ms. Foley regarding RIBs in primary recharge areas. Ms. Hardy said RIBs for utilities probably should be addressed individually. She did not believe it would be good to limit those protections to a specific springshed. She suggested relying on DEP and coordinating the county regulations with DEPs. She thought impact on spring sheds should be one of several factors to consider.

Chairman Newman suggested that staff bring back a goal covering these issues. Ms. Hardy suggested wording similar to “all sensitive sites”.

Storm Water

Mr. Schue said Objective 1.5 should be more descriptive of the collaborative process between the water district, the cities and counties. He suggested "Lake County shall coordinate with SJRWMD to develop a master storm water plan for the Wekiva Study Area and adopt policies consistent with that plan".

Chairman Newman questioned if it was necessary to suggest such detailed revisions.

Mr. Dunkel said the Wekiva Protection Act has many specific requirements and the County must comply with that legislation.

Ms. Foley said the master storm water plan incorporates the Lake County Water Authority (LCWA) and the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD).

Mr. Schue said the distinction was that for the Wekiva Study Area it would be a combined plan for the region, not just Lake County's storm water.

Mr. Schneider said Lake County is contributing funds, and they would be implementing that master plan.

Ms. Hardy said it is common to have multiple agencies involved in storm water master plans. She said staff could submit different language. She thought this was a county-wide issue and did not just apply to the Wekiva area.

The LPA spent some time talking about the best ways to proceed with discussion on the proposed elements. There was concern about keeping discussions restricted to the specific topics before the LPA without getting too involved in details. Some members were concerned that without reminders to stay on topic the planning process could become disjointed and make the whole process more difficult. Everyone agreed to make an effort to restrict their comments to the topic before the LPA and to limit their personal comments.

Bob Curry voiced a concern about injection technologies. He thought policies and objectives should be written to respond to possible future requests to inject some type of water into the aquifer. Ms. King said staff would review that issue.

In response to an earlier question, Mr. Welstead said the county provides no funding to the Leesburg Airport.

Sanitary Sewer

Ms. King said because the County has elected not to provide utilities, they are provided by private utility companies or by the municipalities.

Ms. Shannon gave a brief description of the goals.

Mr. Schue asked for clarification on Objective 1.4, Ms. Suffron said that the objective referred to both central sewer and individual septic. She added that policies could relate to one issue or both.

In response to Ms. Foley's concern about policies on the spreading of septic tank sludge, Ms. Hardy said the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regulates the disposal of septic tank sludge. Mr. Welstead said the County issues Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) for the spreading of sludge. He asked the LPA for their thoughts on that use. Ms. Foley commented if septic tank pump-outs were required this would become a bigger issue. Mr. Schue thought the spreading of septic tank sludge in the Wekiva Study Area should be prohibited and perhaps the Green Swamp should also be included. There was a consensus that staff would review this issue. Mr. Schue and Ms. King discussed the scientific basis for prohibiting the spreading of septic tank sludge in the Wekiva Study Area.

Potable Water

Mr. Dunkel believed the County should challenge the permitting of subdivisions on septic tanks by Polk and Osceola Counties within the Green Swamp. He thought those subdivisions should be challenged before the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) in order to protect the county's water supply.

Ms. Suffron asked the LPA if mandatory sewer hook-ups should be based on distance, density or land use. Mr. Dunkel and Mr. Carey thought density should be a consideration. Mr. Schue agreed and asked if every homeowner within a particular land use category would be required to have sewer even if the individual lot size was larger than the minimum. Ms. King commented that individual homeowners do not go through the planning department. Ms. King and Mr. Schue discussed this issue. There was consensus for mandatory hook-up to be based on density. She said a new land use category of one dwelling unit to one acre was being considered and asked if densities higher than that should be required to have sewer. Mr. Schue said new technologies are available to reduce the level of nitrogen to a level comparable with a central system. He thought densities higher than one dwelling to one acre should not be on septic.

Ms. King asked if density should also be the basis for central water. Mr. Dunkel thought new homes on wells should be required to have flow meters. Ms. Hardy agreed but said that requirement would be different from the State's and monitoring would be difficult. She suggested new homeowners be required to get a well permit showing the maximum capacity. Such a requirement would give the County a capacity number for private wells and agriculture.

Mr. Dunkel suggested eliminating landscaping that requires high levels of irrigation. Ms. Hardy said SJRWMD is writing a model landscape ordinance linked to water usage, not to specific plants. Ms. Hardy hoped some of that language could be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan.

In response to a comment from Mr. Jordan, Ms. Hardy enumerated some of the potential problems with flow meters on individual wells.

Mr. Minkoff said in the past when the County wanted to certify well drillers, they could not because it conflicted with the jurisdiction of SJRWMD. Ms. Hardy said other counties were able to gather data from the well drillers.

Ms. King stated that the LPA that policies should be broad so the Land Development Regulations (LDRs) can address them. She said today's focus should be to make sure policies do not prohibit the County from putting some of these ideas into practice.

Ms. King asked the LPA for general guidelines regarding mandatory hook ups.

Mr. Dunkel suggested a combination of distance and density.

Mr. Minkoff said some potential problems could be avoided if mandatory hook ups were based on the allowable density, not the actual density.

Ms. King said because of some septic failures the Department of Health (DOH) has asked the County to prohibit septic tanks on quarter acre lots. DOH does not want septic tanks on lots less than a half acre.

Ms. King asked how the LPA felt about interim systems. Mr. Schue thought one dwelling unit to one acre, clustered, should be allowed with enhanced onsite system. Ms. King thought the standard was a third acre. Ms. Foley thought clustering would require larger tanks and fields. Mr. Minkoff said in a practical sense, clustering only works with central utilities because wells and septic can not be used on lots smaller than a half acre. In general most people do not consider half acre lots to be clustered. In response to a comment from Mr. Dunkel, Mr. Minkoff and Ms. King explained that the State requires a minimum half acre lot for individual wells and septic. The State allows individual septic tanks on quarter acre lots with central water. There was a short discussion about lot size versus density.

Ms. Foley said she would not want to be subject to mandatory utility hook-up because there was a higher density development "further down the road". Mr. Minkoff said that was the law today, it was in the current Comprehensive Plan and there is also a separate State DOH rule for new development. Existing users do not have to hook-up unless there is a system failure. He added that the state law could be read to require hook-up within one year of notification that utilities are available.

Mr. Dunkel asked how their recommendation would impact the JPAs. Ms. King replied the Mt. Dora JPA requires central utilities. Mr. Minkoff thought the Clermont JPA would ultimately be on central utilities. Ms. King said utility issues would be addressed with each individual municipality.

Ms. King summarized the consensus of the LPA as follows: density would be the basis for mandatory utility hook-ups; one dwelling unit to one acre would be the cut-off for septic and potable water; in environmentally sensitive areas the new septic tank technology would be considered.

There was additional discussion on this issue. Mr. Minkoff suggested the LPA consult with the cities because of their complaints about developments on well and septic and the problems created later when utilities from the cities become available. Mr. Minkoff explained that not requiring hook up could eventually make the running of utilities lines too expensive and the end result would be more septic tanks.

Chairman Newman suggested Ms. King bring back different language for consideration. She agreed with Mr. Minkoff's suggestion to consult with the municipalities. Ms. King said in general the municipalities required an annexation agreement when utilities were provided. Then when the land became contiguous it would be incorporated into the city.

The LPA adjourned for lunch.

The meeting reconvened at 1:30.

Economic Element

Alfredo Massa, Senior Planner emphasized some of the pertinent parts of this element. He listed the largest employers in the county in the following order the School Board, then medical professions, the Sprint call-in center and Lake County Government. The retail trade is the largest sector, followed by construction, health care and government. He said the relatively lower income jobs such as retail has the largest number of employees and conversely the highest income professions have the lowest number of citizens. He added that 64% of the citizens work in Lake County and 16% have a college education.

Mr. Schue didn't think this was the data that was needed and he was interested in what other counties are doing. He said the lack of higher educational opportunities should not be used as a reason for not improving Lake County's economy.

Ms. Foley said there are cooperative college degree programs available through Lake/Sumter Community College.

Ms. King said she had spoken with local business owners, who suggested the County send a clear message that business is welcome here. They also advised reducing bureaucracy by creating FLUE areas for businesses.

Mr. Schue was concerned that the county not be limited to lower income jobs and the county feeling as if they have to focus on providing even more housing for that work force with the reduced expectation that low-income jobs will continue to characterize Lake County. He would like to investigate other economic opportunities and how these concerns have been addressed in other areas. Mr. Massa agreed that opportunities need

to be sought out, and said that issue was addressed in the Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOPs). Mr. Schue said he would like data about the land uses that generate income and those that don't. Ms. King said Mr. Schue's comments were similar to the Fiscal Impact Analysis model, which looks at the economic impact analysis of a project that the State is encouraging. Ms. King said staff would investigate a method for making regional comparisons and the revenue benefit versus deficit. There was consensus from the LPA to follow Ms. King's suggestion. Staff will come back with an answer or an alternative solution.

Ms. Foley said it would be necessary to address the general location of land to be set aside for economic development. She discussed qualities necessary in a successful economic area and said it would be nice to investigate successful models. Ms. King said there is a high intensity future land use category being proposed in the new FLUM.

Mr. Jordan said he was in favor of accepting the DIA as submitted.

In response to a question from Mr. Dunkel, Mr. Massa said that the population of the older citizens in the county would be increasing. Mr. Dunkel pointed out that senior citizens were not generally part of the work force, and that encouraging younger people to move to the county would be a good thing.

Mr. Carey emphasized the importance of quality of life issues when businesses consider areas for relocation and he didn't believe the recent headlines regarding the school situation would be conducive to attracting people. That situation is creating a bad image.

Mr. Schue agreed on the importance of the message. He thought the economic benefit of parks and natural lands in Lake County should also be emphasized. Mr. Schue submitted a publication from the State describing the economic benefit of Florida's State Parks. There was a consensus by the LPA to include this in the DIA.

Capital Improvements

Alfredo Massa said a team of staff members have been working on this element. They were still working towards a methodology.

In response to Ms. Foley, Ms. King said the funds for the Public Land Acquisition program would be included.

Housing

Alfredo Massa covered the goals briefly and said he was looking forward to the comments of the LPA. He thought it was important to focus on affordable housing because of the current deficit that is projected to worsen. He added that he didn't believe the private sector could be relied upon to address that issue.

Mr. Schue said the whole spectrum has to be considered, he was concerned about

financing housing and infrastructure without an adequate economic basis. Mr. Schue was concerned over the term “market demand” used several times in the objectives, particularly noting the mobile home section. He suggested removing it. He also suggested adding to the end of Objective HOU 1.1: “consistent with the 2025 plan in providing existence of adequate infrastructure and services.”

Mr. Schue suggested the following language to be added to Objective 2.4, Location of Housing Units, “develop policies and programs within urban areas to discourage the concentration of affordable, single, and multi-family housing”.

Mr. Schue referred to Objective 2.5, Permitting Process and said he did not think the county needed to give the housing industry any additional help. He said he might consider supporting it for very low income affordable housing. Mr. Massa said this section is focused on “affordable housing”.

Chairman Newman asked if there was a consensus to include Mr. Schue’s suggestions.

Mr. Dunkel did not have a problem with the inclusion of “market driven” because the local economy is service oriented and that need will probably increase. He thought it would be good to provide affordable housing close to the population centers of senior citizens. He added that incentives and private/public partnerships might be necessary, but it would be market driven. Mr. Jordan and Ms. Newman agreed.

Mr. Carey wanted to eliminate “market driven” because he didn’t believe that there was any other kind of market.

Mr. Schue thought the term “market” reflects simply the desire of the applicant.

Chairman Newman asked for a show of hands for a consensus, there were 5 members in favor of the term “market driven” remaining, with Mr. Schue and Mr. Carey in favor of removing the reference.

In response to a comment from Mr. Carey, Mr. Massa said they wanted to minimize the demolition of homes that were more affordable and then replacing them with more expensive homes.

There was a consensus by the LPA on Policy 2.5 to add the word “affordable” before housing.

A majority of the LPA was in agreement to leave Policy 2.4 as submitted. Mr. Schue did not support this.

Recreation and Conservation

Ms. King explained there is much shared information in these elements, therefore Amylin Regis and Shannon Suffron, Senior Planners would address the LPA together.

Ms. Suffron briefly explained the 4 goals in the Recreation Element. She explained the element was still being revised. Mr. Schue said he would present his comments to her in writing.

Open Space was an issue staff wanted to discuss with the LPA. Chairman Newman said she thought there should be references between the 2 elements on Open Space.

Mr. Dunkel thought philosophically that Open Space should be included in all the elements. He said developers consider land in Lake County to be a profitable commodity. He spoke in favor of lower densities, he said that acres of rooftops would not attract businesses, nor would overcrowded schools. He believed that this process should be slowed down and that the County should promote the open space.

Mr. Carey thought that was what good planning should be, looking at the whole county and then planning for development and for open space.

There was a discussion on what Open Space is. Mr. Schue said that in general terms it could be the areas with low densities such as the Green Swamp, or it could be a design element within a development. He thought Open Space should be in multiple places in the Comprehensive Plan depending on the specific context in which the term is used. Ms. King said Lake County considers golf courses to be Open Space and asked if Open Space be open to the public and should a lake be considered as open space.

Ms. Foley said DCA has a definition of open space. Ms. King said DCA wanted to know what open space was to Lake County. Ms. Foley said in the public comments they had received, the public didn't want change or the loss of their surrounding open space. She wanted it to be clear in the new plan that people could be assured the open space in their neighborhoods wouldn't change.

Mr. Jordan said open space was really a population and density issue. He thought everything possible should be done to decrease the opportunities to increase the density.

Ms. King wanted the LPA to consider open space within the context of these elements. Mr. Dunkel suggested giving a value to different types of open space, such as golf courses. Ms. Foley said during the EAR process they tried to not include golf courses as open space, but that did not happen. She suggested that for many people open space was their view shed.

Bob Curry spoke about the subjective element in defining a topic such as open space. He said that everyone will disagree with some part of any definition of open space. He suggested it could be defined as an objective to be approached.

Ms. King suggested that staff draft a definition for the LPA to consider because DCA is requiring a definition from the county.

Ms. Foley suggested in the Recreation Element open space should be in the framework of more intense densities, in the Conservation Element it should be less density because of the water recharge.

Ms. King replied in the Conservation Element open space would be included in wildlife corridors, green printing and other areas of that element. In the FLUE context it would be densities and in the Recreation Element open space would have a more active use.

Ms. Foley said the Conservation Element addresses open land many different ways, which would be a more expansive outlook. In the Recreation Element it would address what is appropriate for higher densities.

Bob Curry said that the term is subjective.

Mr. Schue agreed with Mr. Curry that Open Space is a very subjective term. He thought it should be addressed specifically when a particular technical definition is needed. He suggested when considering a proposed development, that adding an adjective to it such as “jurisdictional open space” or “common open space” would be appropriate.

Mr. Dunkel said philosophically the protection of open space should be addressed in every element such as encouraging clustering. He added that there are many vested lots located in infill areas to be developed before building in “green-fill” areas. He suggested becoming involved with Farmland Trust and doing anything else to preserve open space for recharge, view shed and said ultimately that will increase the value of our county and the quality of life. That will also help the schools to catch up with the overcrowding.

Ms. King said DCA may be satisfied with a philosophical definition, provided that adjectives are added within the elements as needed.

Mr. Jordan said he understood from Mr. Curry that there would be a qualitative aspect to the definition of open space and that DCA was looking for a literal, more quantitative definition.

Mr. Welstead referred to Mr. Jordan’s earlier statement and asked the LPA to think about forcing densities into municipalities or other specific locations, which would guarantee open space. He asked that they think about that and discuss it at the next meeting.

Old Business

Ms. King updated the LPA on the MPO charette. She said during the second series of public meetings that each individual area would review the results from the first meeting in their zone. And they would review the LPA material in coordination with those results.

Ms. King said Sean Parks asked that she remind the LPA to review the South Lake Interim Design Standards.

Ms. King said she had not received any comments contrary to the proposed land use designations and said there was consensus to move forward in that direction.

There was discussion that LPA monthly meetings will probably last all day for the remainder of the year.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

Donna R. Bohrer
Office Associate III

Keith Schue
Secretary