MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY

AUGUST 28, 2006

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2006, at 12:00 p.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
Ann Dupee	District 2
Michael F. Carey	District 3
Richard Dunkel	District 4
Nadine Foley, Vice-Chairman	District 5
Sean Parks	At-Large Representative
Keith Schue, Secretary	At-Large Representative
Barbara Newman, Chairman	At-Large Representative

Members Absent:

Becky Elswick	School Board Representative

Staff Present:

Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney
Cindy Hall, County Manager
Gregg Welstead, Deputy County Manager
Carol Stricklin, AICP, Director Growth Management Department
Amye King, AICP, Deputy Director, Growth Management Department
R. Wayne Bennett, AICP, Planning Director
Brian Sheahan, Chief Planner, Comprehensive Planning
Alfredo Massa, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Francis Franco, Senior GIS Analyst, Comprehensive Planning Division
Bill Gearing, Community Enhancement Coordinator, Community Services
Karen Ginsberg, Senior Planner, Planning and Development Services
Sherie Ross, Public Hearing Coordinator, Planning & Development Services
Donna Bohrer, Office Associate III, Planning & Development Services Division

Barbara Newman, Chairman, re-convened the meeting to order at 12:00 p.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

AGENDA ITEM:	**AGENDA DESCRIPTION**	**PAGE NO.**
	Rural Settlement Category	3
	Workplace Category	8
	Traditional Neighborhood Category	10
	Lake Apopka Protection Area Category	Cont.
	Approval & Transmittal Future Land Use Element	Cont.
	Approval & Transmittal Future Land Use Map	Cont.

Chairman Newman discussed meeting protocol including time limitations for speakers and said exemptions to the time limitation could be requested by prior notification to the Chair.

Keith Schue wanted to state on the record that he didn't believe they had adequate time to review this draft because it was not received until Friday afternoon and he believed it contained significant changes. Chairman Newman believed if everyone kept their comments focused on the agenda items, it would be possible to complete the agenda.

Amye King, AICP, Deputy Director, Growth Management, briefed the LPA on the revised agenda.

Carol Stricklin, AICP, Director, Growth Management briefly outlined the schedule of the Board of County Commissioner's (BCC) work sessions and transmittal meeting for the Comprehensive Plan.

Richard Dunkel wanted to be sure there was adequate time allowed for review of the Future Land Use Map (FLUM).

Chairman Newman emphasized the importance of making clear and concise motions and said additional staff was present to assist.

Mr. Schue presented copies of his written comments to the LPA and to staff.

RURAL SETTLEMENT

R. Wayne Bennett, AICP, Planning Director, Planning and Development Services, said the proposed Rural Settlements (RS) were designated on the map by dotted-line circles. He said staff was recommending that boundaries be set with input from residents within six-months after the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. He said densities, intensities and uses would be defined through "context-based policy," which meant the densities and intensities would remain the same as they were at the time of adoption. This would also recognize the uniqueness of each area. Mr. Bennett said it was general planning practice that densities, intensities and uses were determined by the plan classification and zoning ordinance. And design elements are set out in the overlay district. He said it was staff's recommendation that the Historic Settlement Overlay District and the RS boundaries be coterminous.

Mr. Schue was concerned the RS policies could result in increased urban densities in rural areas of the County. He referred to the second paragraph in Policy 1.3.1.4, and said he didn't agree that uses, densities and intensities should be determined at the time of development application. He was particularly concerned about the three RS dots in the general areas of the Wekiva and the Ocala Forest. He proposed policy, which he believed would recognize those historic areas and yet maintain the rural nature of the surrounding areas.

Nadine Foley said that the remainder of the sentence referred to by Mr. Schue stated that

the land use characteristics would remain the same as they were at the time of the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. She believed that policy would protect the integrity of those communities, which was something she had been concerned about for some time.

Michael Carey said one of his concerns regarding the rural plan was that the lower density and large lot requirements would mean that only the "haves" could afford to live in rural areas. He believed the RS could allow residents of more moderate means access to a more rural lifestyle.

In response to comments from Mr. Dunkel, Mr. Bennett explained these RS are special places, and he thought the context-based framework was the most restrictive approach possible. He said defining the boundaries of those RS would be a key issue and said public input from the residents was essential to setting those boundaries.

David Jordan was concerned about textual changes to the draft and the new categories appearing on the FLUM. He said that he didn't believe all the decisions made in motions have been reflected in the work product. The Chairman said the County was under pressure from the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to adopt a new Comprehensive Plan. She said all of the motions had been recorded in the adopted minutes. Mr. Jordan was concerned about the "red-lined" definition of Open Space. Mr. Bennett said the Open Space definition adopted by the LPA was applicable for the entire County.

Ms. Foley said the agenda details the items that remain to be decided upon and said the LPA has always wanted to protect the Historic Villages.

MOTION by Nadine Foley, SECONDED by Michael Carey to include in the Future Land Use Element policy for Rural Settlements, currently numbered as Policy 1.3.1.4, to provide structure and be used in accompaniment with the Overlay District on page 1-127.

Mr. Dunkel agreed that each community should be reviewed independently but thought the six-month time frame was too long.

Mr. Schue thought the boundaries were evident through the Property Appraiser's records. He referred to a map he submitted, which showed a discrepancy between the actual location of Paisley and the dotted-circle on the map.

Sean Parks arrived at 12:45 p.m.

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Richard Dunkel to AMEND the motion by substituting his suggested policy language.

Ms. Foley said the time frame to define boundaries in this policy was longer than that

proposed by staff.

Chairman Newman read Mr. Schue's amendment to the motion. "By January 1, 2008, the County shall identify community planning areas in the vicinity of Astor Park, Schockley Heights, Paisley, Lake Kathryn, and Forest Hills. Within each community planning area, it shall be the express intent of Lake County to recognize and protect the integrity of historically developed settlements identified by plat, subdivision site plan, or similar recorded instrument. Within these settlements, development may be allowed to occur that is of urban density or character due to the presence of private lots of records existing prior to March 2, 1993, provided that provisions of this Comprehensive Plan applicable to legal non-conforming uses are satisfied. In order to prevent urban sprawl, however, the boundary of these identified settlements shall not be expanded, and rural residential densities shall be maintained within each community planning area outside of these historically developed settlements. If appropriate, by January 1, 2008, the County shall consider the creation of a future land use category for the sole purpose of recognizing existing, historically developed settlements, provided, however, that the geographic boundary of such a future land use category does not exceed the size or residential density of the settlement originally created by plat, subdivision site plan, or similar recorded instrument."

PUBLIC COMMENT
Vicki Zaneis said she appreciated everyone's hard work and agreed the LPA should not be rushed. She supported protecting rural areas and was concerned the RS could allow development in rural areas.

Robert Curry was concerned about land uses that could be "grandfathered" in these RS. He did not think enough time had been allowed to review the RS policies and said he would support the amendment.

Charles Lee said he represented Audubon of Florida. He described his understanding of the Rural Settlement policy, asked if it was correct and disputed the fairness of the time limitations placed on speakers.

In response to Mr. Lee's comment regarding the fairness of the day's proceedings, Mr. Carey said it was important to treat each other with respect, and to act with decorum. He emphasized that the entire Comprehensive Plan process had been very open to the public from the beginning.

Mr. Lee said it appeared to him that the boundaries, densities and uses of the proposed Rural Settlements would not be reviewed by the DCA but would be regulated by actions, which were not subject to data and analysis. He said some of the 23 proposed Rural Settlements are located in environmentally sensitive areas and said he would support the amendment.

Mr. Bennett agreed that the LDRs would have a zoning district to reflect the RS land use

category. However, he said the Comprehensive Plan amendment process would not be precluded, modified or changed in any way.

Peggy Belflower said the number of proposed historic settlements had increased and thought they should return to the original eight communities. She said Lake Mack and Forest Hills were one census-defined settlement and they were not villages. She believed those residents just wanted to be left alone.

Chris Belflower thought this was worse than the Rural Village concept proposed earlier. He believed this was a "last ditch attempt" by the developers to urbanize rural areas. He said rural residents had made it very clear that they did not want to have urban densities and didn't believe the Rural Settlement Policy should be approved. He also disagreed with the proposed settlements in the Wekiva and Ocala areas.

Linda Stewart commented that many citizens distrust their government and said that is why this Comprehensive Plan is so important. She said the residents of the County wanted to retain the rural areas and this proposal was not rural. She, also, thought developers have too much influence over the planning process.

Rob Kelly, Citizen's Coalition of Lake County, thought the definition of Rural Settlement was cryptic and that it has been repeatedly brought back before LPA. He was concerned about the expansion of these settlements. He said they supported the amendment, returning to the original overlays and letting the community planning process go forward.

Mr. Carey discussed rural communities he had visited in different areas of the country. He said he had seen many viable rural communities that had not destroyed the aesthetic value of those rural areas. He said his research showed that higher densities could compliment the rural areas with lower densities. He believed it was very important to protect all areas of the County, including the rural, urban and transitional areas.

Fred Cranmer said the Friends of Ferndale have spent considerable time seeking a Historic Village designation for their community. He believed the details of the Historic Villages should be included in the Comprehensive Plan because he believed that would give those areas the most protection.

Mr. Bennett said staff could compile a list of possible rural settlements, or community planning areas and the LPA could define the eligible communities to be considered for a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Then the LPA and the community residents could define boundaries, densities and intensities, which would also be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Foley said protecting these areas had been discussed during the EAR process. She believed this amendment could once again postpone that protection. She supported adopting this Future Land Use now and said this policy would protect those areas from intrusion. She asked if the Rural Settlements had to be shown on the FLUM at this time.

Mr. Bennett said the category and policies could be included and the definitions done at a later time.

Mr. Schue said he would support the Historic Village overlay but he didn't agree with an undefined land use category being placed on the FLUM.

Mr. Jordan said he would not vote for the RS because the elimination of timeliness removed a "threat" to the Historic Villages. He said there had not been 23 citizens groups requesting this designation. He didn't believe the existing non-conforming uses within the Historic Villages were a serious issue and said the areas surrounding these proposed RS are currently rural. He asked Mr. Schue to withdraw his motion and suggested they just vote the original motion up or down.

In response to Mr. Dunkel's question regarding the possibility of RS incorporating, Sanford Minkoff, County Attorney, said those communities would have to meet the statutory requirements for incorporation and not all of them would qualify. Mr. Dunkel was concerned about possible annexations and said that was why he disagreed with the time frame.

Mr. Parks said he could support Mr. Bennett's suggestion to include policy but to withhold designating specific areas on the FLUM. However, he preferred the original language.

Ann Dupee discussed the differences between the RS and Historic Villages, the increased number proposed and didn't believe that tiny rural areas populated primarily with mobile homes should be considered for this policy.

Mr. Bennett said there are two types of RS, the very tiny and the larger, more urban areas such as Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento area. He said it was staff's interpretation that the overlay district could not be larger than the settlement classification and the overlay would be created through and by residential input.

Mr. Jordan believed if the RS allowed any increase in density; then that was its purpose.

Mr. Schue restated his position against this policy and demonstrated this concern with a pen sketch.

Mr. Minkoff said the amendment must be voted on before the original motion.

FOR:	**Schue**
ABSENT:	**Elswick**
AGAINST:	**Newman, Foley, Carey, Parks, Dunkel, Dupee, Jordan**
AMENDMENT FAILED:	**1-7**

AMENDMENT TO MOTION by Nadine Foley, SECONDED BY Michael Carey to say that no Rural Settlement "circles" would be placed on the Future Land Use Map

at this time and that Rural Settlements be designated only if the process is used.

Mr. Schue believed designating the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento area a RS could imply that a similar pattern would be suitable for a rural area of the County.

Ms. Foley said she saw this proposed category as a way to move forward with a way to protect those rural communities, however, she said some people may construe it to be a way to increase densities. There was discussion on the official adoption date.

Mr. Bennett disagreed with Mr. Schue's statement that the RS were a way to put urban densities in rural areas. He said the RS would "lock in" the current densities unless a Comprehensive Plan amendment was adopted by the LPA and the BCC. Mr. Jordan and Mr. Schue discussed that this policy was "nebulous," that it could constitute a "taking" and that residents would pursue this designation out of fear of losing property rights and that developers could take advantage of that situation.

Mr. Parks said he would be able to support the amendment because it removed the "dots" from the FLUM.

Ms. Foley restated the amendment

FOR:	**Newman, Foley, Carey, Parks, Dupee,**
ABSENT:	**Elswick**
AGAINST:	**Jordan, Dunkel, Schue**
MOTION PASSED:	**5-3**

Ms. Foley restated the original motion with the amendment.

FOR:	**Newman, Foley, Carey, Dupee**
ABSENT:	**Elswick**
AGAINST:	**Jordan, Schue, Dunkel, Parks**
MOTION DEFEATED:	**4-4**

After some discussion, Mr. Minkoff said it was not necessary to have an additional motion to remove the text because the intent of the motion was clear.

There was a five-minute break at 2:00 p.m. Chairman Newman said she had requested a revised and more detailed agenda to facilitate discussion.

WORKPLACE DISTRICT (WD)

Mr. Bennett explained that this category had been known previously as the High Intensity Development District (HIDD) and said the changes in this draft reflected earlier concerns regarding residential uses. This proposed policy includes primary/employment uses and supporting personal uses.

Mr. Schue referred to the fifth paragraph and suggested that the percentage be calculated on the "net land area" in order to avoid an imbalance of uses. Ms. Dupee was concerned about restricting commercial uses because the County lacks sufficient employment

opportunities.

In response to Mr. Jordan's question regarding the balance of uses, Mr. Bennett explained that before any rezoning to WD can be approved, a Special Area Plan (SAP) must be adopted. That SAP will address specific development issues, such as infrastructure, design and financing.

There was discussion on using "net versus gross" and that it would be an undevelopable lands neutral policy if it is amended to be "net." Mr. Bennett said staff would support the "net."

There was consensus with the suggestion to add primary and secondary schools to the support uses.

There was consensus to reference the Level of Service (LOS) for facilities and utilities.

There was consensus to include a minimum 25% Open Space requirement.

MOTION by Michael Carey, SECONDED by Nadine Foley to adopt the Workplace category as revised.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Wayne Saunders, Clermont City Manager, said they would support the change from "gross" to "net." He was concerned that the entire 25% of support uses could be residential. He thought it would be good to ensure that the residential wasn't built before the employment opportunities are on site.

Cyndi Tarapani, said she was a planner with Florida Design Consultants and she was unsure of the definition of low-impact high-tech uses. Mr. Bennett said they would be similar to light industrial uses. However, the term would be defined in greater detail in the LDRs.

Ms. Foley thought Mr. Saunders made a good point and suggested the primary and secondary uses should be developed concurrently and said that could be stated in the SAP. She agreed that the residential should not be built first.

After some discussion, Ms. Foley said specifics could be included in the SAP and would make it possible, in some cases, to take into consideration the surrounding land uses. She suggested language similar to "support services and the primary services should be addressed for concurrency within the SAP." Staff typed on screen "support uses shall be developed/constructed after the completion of the principal development." Mr. Bennett suggested "these uses shall be developed subsequent to the completion of a significant portion of the planned development program for primary uses," with a definition of "significant." His second suggestion was "maximum amounts of land and/or building within the support use category should be established at the time of the approval of the SAP for each Workplace District."

Michael Carey left the meeting at 2:30 p.m. and will return later.

There was consensus that residential densities should be calculated on the percentage of land dedicated to residential development.

There was consensus to restore the crossed through text "minimum density of 4 DU/net acre, maximum of 12 DU/net acre" in the chart on page 1-16 and in the text of the policy.

FOR:	**Newman, Foley, Schue, Parks, Dunkel, Dupee, Jordan**
ABSENT:	**Elswick, Carey**
AGAINST:	**None**
MOTION PASSED:	**7-0**

Ann Dupee left the meeting.

TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD LAND USE (TN)

Mr. Bennett explained that this category was formerly referred to as the Mixed Use category. He said an overall cap on residential units of four units per acre had been added. He said densities could be distributed with the higher densities in the center of the TN and the lower densities at the edge areas. Mr. Bennett said in general the amount of square footage of commercial uses in the center areas are sized in relationship to the size of the residential component. He suggested determining that ratio within the LDRs to allow adequate time for research and he thought flexibility in that ratio would allow consideration of adjacent uses and transportation access.

Mr. Schue referred to the written materials he distributed earlier and asked if staff would support language requiring adequate employment opportunities within the vicinity. Referring to the FLUM, Mr. Bennett said workplace districts were located in general proximity to traditional neighborhoods. He cautioned about linking workplace numbers to the residential numbers, and said staff could research that issue.

Mr. Dunkel asked if these TN aspects could be applied to DRIs. Mr. Bennett said there is nothing to preclude that and he thought it would be a benefit to the County. There was discussion about reviewing DRIs according to the TN principles. Mr. Bennett suggested that those TN principles should be used only for DRIs with residential components.

There was discussion regarding the Mixed Use Districts, the TN category and the FLUM. Ms. Stricklin said the FLUM presented today was a staff recommended FLUM and it was a staff initiative. Staff wanted to present a map to accommodate the projected population of 2025.

Mr. Schue suggested "capable of providing jobs within one mile of the TN." Ms. Foley agreed because that it takes into consideration existing surrounding uses. Mr. Bennett suggested that requirement apply only to new TNs because the ones currently on the map are associated with Workplace Districts. Mr. Jordan thought this was an urban

development and discussed regional versus internal capture rates. There was discussion on the proposed language shown on the screen. Mr. Bennett suggested "for any future proposed TN district proposal, it must be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the approving agency that a work place or other type of employment district is, exists or is planned to exist within (blank) miles of the proposal." Mr. Schue suggested modifying it to it must be demonstrated that an employment area exists or is planned to exist within a mile of the project. Mr. Jordan thought the one-mile requirement was too similar to "timeliness" and he was concerned that this land use could be used to build a neighborhood somewhere. Mr. Parks thought the 20% capture rate would be a strong enough criteria to create the employment or commercial base. There was extensive discussion on this topic. Ms. Foley preferred "within close proximity." Mr. Schue suggested moving the paragraph under discussion to another location.

There was consensus with Mr. Bennett's suggestion to include it with the Smart Growth Framework.

There was agreement with Mr. Schue's suggestion to change the open space calculation from "gross land area" to "net land area" in the table on page 1-27. There was discussion on the open space allocation between the center areas and the edge areas. Mr. Schue suggested including a threshold and that the total should not be less than 25%.

Ms. Foley said the Open Space definition they agreed upon applied to the whole County and said the issue was really the internal distribution of the Open Space.

There was consensus to keep the table figures as "targets" but to require a total of 25% open space in the entire project.

There was discussion on 1.4.1.8 and the quality of open space for those areas in the Neighborhood Center. Mr. Parks thought open space in these centers should be more flexible. Mr. Schue was concerned that this could confuse the definition of open space and suggested "active open space." Several members were satisfied with the policy as it reads.

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by David Jordan, that Policy 1.4.1.8 be modified that the Open Space area within the Neighborhood Center be renamed "Active Public Space" and then define it to include hardscape, pedestrian amenities and landscape.

MOTION REVISED by Keith Schue, SECONDED by David Jordan, to read "the overall open space requirement consistent with the definition of open space requirement consistent with the definition of open space shall be a minimum of 25% over the entire development."

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill Ray said this policy would increase the open space and active public space required within these developments and would exceed the 25% required initially.

FOR:	**Newman, Foley, Schue, Parks, Dunkel, Jordan**
ABSENT:	**Elswick, Carey, Dupee**
AGAINST:	**None**
MOTION PASSED:	**6-0**

Ms. Foley thought the second bulleted item under Policy 1.4.1.8 had value. Mr. Dunkel believed this to be a LDR issue. Mr. Schue said it could be removed.

MOTION by David Jordan, SECONDED by Richard Dunkel to remove the second bulleted number under Policy 1.4.1.8.

FOR:	**Newman, Schue, Parks, Dunkel, Jordan**
ABSENT:	**Elswick, Carey, Dupee**
AGAINST:	**Foley**
MOTION PASSED:	**5-1**

Mr. Sheahan asked the LPA to review the material this motion would remove from the policy. After some discussion, it was the consensus of the LPA that the motion applied to the entire bulleted item.

There was consensus by the LPA in the first bulleted item under Policy 1.4.1.8 to end the paragraph after "percent," deleting "of the gross…wetlands."

MOTION by Nadine Foley, SECONDED by Sean Parks to add to the Future Land Use Element the land use category, Traditional Neighborhood, as defined in Policy 1.4.1.1 through 1.4.1.12, as revised.

Mr. Schue commented that on Page 1.32 the allocation of civic and public uses should be calculated on the "net" land area.

Ms. Foley had no objection to changing the motion so that the allocation of civic and public uses would be calculated on the "net" land area.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Wayne Saunders, Clermont City Manager, thought the Traditional Neighborhood should be located within the municipalities or the Joint Planning Areas (JPAs) because this was an urban use. He suggested basing the density on the residential area of the TN and not the total amount of the area. He also thought the minimum density should be eliminated.

Michael Carey returned at 4:00 p.m.

Jeanne Etter was concerned regarding the quality of the job base that would be provided by the Traditional Neighborhood category.

Ms. Foley confirmed that the text included in the motion began with Policy 1.4.1.1. In

addressing the concern of Mr. Saunders, Ms. Foley thought that because utilities were required, this category would generally have utilities provided through one of the cities. Mr. Schue said he would consider support for limiting this category to JPAs. Mr. Parks said public meetings must be held to plan for all SAPs. Mr. Dunkel said he would like to use the TN policies as a framework to review DRIs.

Mr. Bennett said that there are few opportunities in the County to create employment. Mr. Jordan said when the cities' input had been solicited by the County, this land use category was not on the list. Mr. Schue stated that after hearing the discussion, he felt that the existence of the TN category was appropriate, but its location should be determined judiciously.

Sherie Ross, Planning and Development Services, restated the motion and the consensus items as follows: the language on the screen regarding TN close proximity to workplace; on page 1-31 the paragraph ended after the word "percent;" on page 1-32 change to "net" and approval of the TN category.

FOR:	**Newman, Foley, Schue, Parks, Dunkel, Carey**
ABSENT:	**Elswick, Dupee**
AGAINST:	**Jordan**
MOTION PASSED:	**6-1**

There was discussion regarding the continuation of this meeting to September 11, 2006 and the availability of a quorum.

Mr. Carey discussed a map he requested staff to prepare which shows the rural and conservation areas. He questioned how or where the population growth would go because this map shows that the County is close to a "no growth policy." He said the urban and transition areas are pretty well defined. He believed that this graphic depiction of the County was important to the discussion on how to accommodate the projected population increase.

Mr. Bennett said staff believes that Mr. Carey raises an important question, however, staff does not have adequate data at this time. He said that the County is acquiring equipment that will make it possible to answer that question.

PUBLIC COMMENT

James Homich, Vice-Mayor of Mount Dora, said the City Council had requested that the rural land use category remain in their JPA and he said that is not reflected on the FLUM shown at today's meeting.

Darren Gray, Assistant City Manager of Clermont, said Clermont had also requested some rural areas within their JPA, which is not reflected on the FLUM at today's meeting.

Floyd Cranmer thought some of the language on Historic Villages should be reviewed for

consistency with the removal of the Rural Settlement category. He wanted to see this process move forward for Ferndale to protect their community.

Ben Champion said he would submit language regarding the State regulations on septic tanks. He said property they owned had originally been divided into three parcels and they were combined into one at the County's request as part of a vacation process. He said that their property is still shown by the County as three parcels on this FLUM, with two future land uses. He asked staff to consider placing it within one land use.

Bob Curry thought that in the TN policies, the Wekiva Study Area (WSA) should have been included on the list of "state sanctioned" areas. He was concerned that some of the non-residential land uses (such as commercial) apply to both rural and non-rural areas. He suggested a General Land Use Category comprised of uses that can be placed in both rural and urban areas.

Rob Kelly was concerned about the amount of population growth projected. He discussed the inventory of developed lands and said there was more than enough inventory of land to accommodate the 2025 projected populations.

James Yatsuk, Mayor of Mount Dora, discussed the Employment Center designation within their JPA area. He said the City did not agree that high density residential uses in that area was the best use of that land. He said that the City also would like to have more flexibility with the FAR within that Employment Center.

Jim Bartlett read into the record a letter referring to the proposed decrease in densities on his property and the potential financial impact.

Mr. Schue commented that he would have specific comments on the FLUM.

At 4:50 p.m. the Chair continued the meeting to September 11, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.

Donna R. Bohrer Office Associate III	Keith Schue Secretary