MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
JUNE 26, 2008

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on JUNE 26, 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:

Jeffrey Schaffer	District 1
Rob Kelly	District 2
Michael F. Carey	District 3
Peggy Belflower, Vice-Chairman	District 4
Nadine Foley, Chairman	District 5
Keith Schue, Secretary	At-Large Representative
Vacant	At-Large Representative

Members Absent:

Vicki Zaneis	At-Large Representative
Cindy Barrow	School Board Representative

Staff Present:

Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney
Brian T. Sheahan, AICP, Planning & Community Design Director
Ian McDonald, AICP, Chief Planner, Planning & Community Design
Donna Bohrer, Public Hearing Coordinator, Planning & Community Design

Nadine Foley, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:12 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.
Review of Action Item List	4

Brian T. Sheahan, AICP, Planning & Community Design Director discussed upcoming meetings and other LPA business. Keith Schue distributed copies of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) agenda from the most recent meeting and directed the LPA's attention to the agenda item regarding the advertisement of Lot Grading Ordinance. He noted that embedded within the advertisement were changes to the ordinance and he was concerned that the ordinance would not be presented as the LPA transmitted it. Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney, said the advertisement under question had been prepared by the Public Works Department and said it had not yet been advertised. She said the ordinance would be advertised as it was approved by the LPA and any changes to the ordinance would be discussed at the public hearing. There was concern by several members that the advertisement request contained a request for changes before the ordinance was heard.

Mr. Sheahan said ordinances go before the BCC as transmitted by the LPA and added that staff has a responsibility to identify pertinent issues, to bring those issues to the attention of the BCC and it is a forewarning that some issues will arise at the public hearing. The LPA discussed the ordinance approval process and their concerns that the ordinance may not be presented to the BCC as recommended by the LPA. Mr. Sheahan said it was staff's responsibility to present their professional opinions to BCC on all ordinances and said the final decision would be made by the BCC. Ms. Marsh repeated that the ordinance as approved by the LPA would be the document received by the BCC.

There was brief discussion regarding the status of the Wekiva Ordinance.

Jeffrey Schaffer presented a chart titled "Comparison of 1990 BEBR Projection to Actual for 2000 and 2005" for discussion. He explained his concern about adopting the lower BEBR numbers. He thought this could significantly delay completion of the Comprehensive Plan and could possibly cause some agencies to plan for less than the actual population.

MOTION by Jeffrey Schaffer, SECONDED by Keith Schue to ask the Board of County Commissioners to reconsider their decision and to adopt the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) medium population projections.

Mr. Schaffer said his concern was the staff time necessary to defend the BCC's decision and the impact this change could have on the plans for other agencies and that under-planning could occur on many fronts. There was discussion about protecting rural areas with borders of transitional areas, the difference between defining the future and just accommodating growth and there was some support for the medium BEBR numbers.
Chairman Foley said the most important thing was finishing the Comprehensive Plan and noted numbers can be adjusted during the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) process. Mr. Schue said that he thought that it could be possible for the LPA to respect the BCC's decision while explaining its approach regarding the FLUM, and suggested tabling this motion.

MOTION withdrawn by Jeffrey Schaffer, SECOND withdrawn by Keith Schue.

Mr. Schaffer suggested further discussion in the future and maybe a motion addressing the LPA's concerns, stating the LPA would continue to draft a defensible FLUM but not necessarily recommend the BCC reconsider that decision.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Curry discussed population projections and the recent "housing bubble." He was concerned about the economic impact of these projections and thought medium figure should be used because of its effect on the five year capital improvements schedule.

The meeting reconvened at 10:47 a.m. after a short break.

Mr. Schaffer presented a "Residential/Non-Residential Sliding Scale" which was shown on the monitor, said his position had changed regarding the mix of residential and non-residential uses, and suggested a 20% overlap. There was discussion about this scale and if there should be an allowance to encourage two story development, how to avoid strip mall development, how to allocate residential and commercial uses and the suitable locations for these integrated developments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jon Pospisil discussed the 'sliding scale' and suggested deferring the details to LDRs. He thought there were several things to be considered, including the best locations for these integrated developments, having a bonus for two story developments, the possible suitability of commercial centers and if affordable housing was included in these uses.

There was discussion regarding the advantages and disadvantages of requiring a mix of uses.

Jon Pospisil noted that bonuses could make those properties more valuable because of the mixed-use and would increase the likelihood of mixed-uses.

REVIEW OF ITEM ACTION LIST

The LPA reviewed Mr. Schue's suggested draft language for Policy 1.4.1.4, Provision of Commercial and Office Use and discussed avoiding strip commercial developments and the different regulations for commercial corridors and centers. Mr. Sheahan said if the LPA wanted commercial uses to be clustered, the policy could state that commercial uses in TND shall be clustered. There was discussion about avoiding strip commercial uses even if they are located interior to the TND. Mr. Sheahan said without some flexibility in these policies that developers could simply scale their developments to fall just below the TND threshold. There was considerable discussion regarding definitions, the intent of these policies, how size should be defined and maintaining consistency with the commercial center policies under Criteria for Commercial Centers and Corridors. In order to avoid confusion between the different centers, Mr. Schaffer suggested using the term "core" in the TND policies.

The meeting reconvened at 1:40 p.m. after a break for lunch.

There was discussion about setting a maximum of commercial use, if the maximums should be in the LDRs, and if the neighborhood core areas should have more flexibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Bob Curry said the terms being used were centrist which implied there would be an approximate equal distance around them. He suggested allowing these uses to be located off center and towards the major road access in order to facilitate deliveries.

The LPA discussed the TND center, including a truly walk-able downtown area, whether these centers are intended to draw people from outside the community, the importance of maintaining viable downtown areas and how these centers should be different from drive-by commercial uses. The LPA agreed with language stating that a Neighborhood Core cannot be located on arterial or collector roadways unless it meets the Commercial Center policy. There was discussion regarding the definition of collector roadways and how those roadways are designated.

Rob Kelly left the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

There was considerable discussion regarding commercial uses within traditional neighborhoods and how to avoid typical strip commercial development.

The meeting reconvened at 3:20 p.m. after a short break.

The LPA discussed Policy 2.1.4, Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Main Street District FLUC and agreed to set a maximum intensity of 0.30, a maximum Impervious Surface Ratio (ISR) of 0.60 and to add a reference stating that pervious parking shall be encouraged.

The LPA discussed Policy 2.1.5, Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Neighborhood FLUC and agreed to set a maximum intensity of 0.20, except for institutional uses which shall have a maximum intensity of 0.30 and a maximum ISR of 0.30.

The LPA agreed to change the maximum ISR to 0.75 in the Regional Office FLUC.

There was discussion regarding Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and Planned Developments, how those terms are used in other jurisdictions, and the uses permitted in those types of designations.

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Jeffrey Schaffer to continue to use the term Planned Unit Development as it has been used.
FOR: Foley, Schue, Carey, Belflower, Schaffer
ABSENT: Zaneis, Barrow, Kelly
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 5-0

The LPA reviewed Policy 7.6.1, Requirements for Planned Unit Development and agreed to require PUD zoning for any development seeking to increase densities above that allowed by the current zoning classification and consisting of 50 or more dwelling units.

There was discussion regarding how the draft policies requiring a PUD and setting a timeframe to commence construction could adversely impact a "non-developer" landowner and the issue of real estate speculation. The LPA agreed to add "with the potential for 50 or more units" to address these concerns.

The LPA reviewed Policy 7.4.2, Agriculture Land Retention Study and discussed the 24 month timeframe to initiate that study. There was discussion regarding Best Management Practices (BMPs) including enforcement. The LPA agreed to minor edits to Policy 7.4.1 Agricultural Primacy as shown on the monitor.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Donna R. Bohrer	Keith Schue
Public Hearing Coordinator	Secretary