MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY

SEPTEMBER 11, 2006

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on MONDAY, September 11, 2006 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.

Members Present:

David Jordan	District 1
Ann Dupee	District 2
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:

Michael F. Carey	District 3
Becky Elswick	School Board Representative

Staff Present:

Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney
Melanie Marsh, Assistant County Attorney
Cindy Hall, 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
Walter Wood, Senior Hydrogeologist, Environmental Services
Dottie Keedy, Director of Economic Development and Redevelopment
Alfredo Massa, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
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

AGENDA ITEM:	**AGENDA DESCRIPTION**	**PAGE NO.**
A	Lake Apopka Protection Area	4
B	Future Land Use Map	10

Chairman Newman briefly addressed the audience regarding meeting protocol, including the time limitation for speakers. There was a moment of silence in recognition of the anniversary of September 11th.

Keith Schue said he had several comments on the Future Land Use Element (FLUE) to discuss.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Robert Curry stepped forward to address the LPA. He stated that it was his belief that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) workshop meeting scheduled for the following day would be a violation of State Statute. Carol Stricklin, AICP, Director, Growth Management, addressed his concerns and explained the purpose of that meeting. Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney, agreed with Ms. Stricklin that the workshop with the BCC was in compliance with the law.

Nadine Foley said the LPA had voted to transmit several elements to the BCC with a recommendation for approval. There was discussion on the status of the Comprehensive Plan and transmittal. Richard Dunkel said he expected some "feedback" on the cost of the proposed Plan. He didn't want to have the Plan rushed. He remained concerned about the population projections and other issues. Keith Schue thought there were open issues in the Future Land Use Element (FLUE) and he discussed the importance of the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), which he viewed as a "land use change" on every piece of property in the County. He thought the BCC should not hold a workshop until the Plan was totally complete. He referred to a Department of Community Affairs (DCA) letter, which stated there would not be a letter of compliance regarding the Wekiva transmittal until the new Comprehensive Plan had been transmitted to them. Mr. Schue was concerned about the schedule to transmit the Comprehensive Plan before DCA's courtesy comments are received on the 15th of October. Sean Parks didn't think there was a problem with the scheduled workshop because the BCC would not be taking action. Ann Dupee said it was time to get to the FLUM and Chairman Newman agreed. In response to comments from David Jordan, Mr. Minkoff said it would be legal for the BCC to schedule workshops before the plan was complete and said in that case the transmittal hearing would be scheduled after the Plan was transmitted. Mr. Schue was concerned that specific issues would be addressed during the BCC workshop and he thought the LPA should know what those issues were. Chairman Newman said only the transmitted elements would be discussed.

Mr. Dunkel asked about the financial feasibility and Amye King, ACIP, Deputy Director, Growth Management, said the feasibility of the Comprehensive Plan is under continual review and the Capital Improvements Element is reviewed annually. She added that the new programs, with 2008 initiation dates, would be reviewed during the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR). Ms. King said the cost of the FLUM has not yet been calculated.

Chairman Newman said every LPA member had received the e-mails referred to by Mr. Schue and said government business could not stop until the new BCC members are

sworn in.

LAKE APOPKA PROTECTION AREA POLICIES

Brian Sheahan, AICP, Chief Planner, said this Goal contained detail, which probably should be in the Land Development Regulations (LDRs). He said the LPA may recommend removal of some of that detail, however, staff wanted to follow the direction they had been given. He said additional policy regarding the Lake Apopka Trail Loop was included.

The LPA:

- Agreed to call it the Lake Apopka Protection Area (LAPA).
- Agreed to delete the final sentence in 4.1.1.
- Agreed that Policy 4.1.2 remain as presented after the following discussion:
    - Ms. Foley felt the task force development guidelines should be respected and said public access was important and a reflection of the tax money spent.
    - Mr. Parks thought the final sentence regarding landowners restoring lakefronts should remain.
    - Mr. Schue said he did not understand that.
    - Ms. Foley referred to the Lake Apopka Basin Design Guidelines and said the last sentence referred to the removal of invasive plants.
- Agreed to remove Policy 4.1.4. Mr. Sheahan said the Potable Water policies would apply to this area.
- Agreed to change Policy 4.1.5. Permitted Uses to the language suggested by Mr. Schue and typed on the screen by Mr. Sheahan. There was discussion on existing and possible commercial uses.
- Agreed with staff's recommendation that accessing and clearing standards should be established in the LDRs. During discussion on the 50-foot lake access, Mr. Minkoff said the County could have stricter standards than the State's 50-foot exemption from permitting. There was a majority consensus to retain the reference to public access.
- Discussed Policy 4.1.8. Mr. Schue suggested central utilities be mandatory in areas of urban densities. Walter Wood, Senior Hydrogeologist, Environmental Services, recommended prohibiting Rapid Infiltration Basins (RIBs) but allowing low rate effluent disposal. After some discussion on the specific wording, there was agreement with language typed on the screen by Mr. Sheahan and striking sentences 3 and 4. There was agreement to allow Mr. Wood time to review this policy and return to it later in the meeting.
- Discussed Policy 4.1.9. Agreed to add to the end "discharges to Lake Apopka or any connected surface waters."
- Agreed on Policy 4.1.10. Agreement with the language shown on the screen, which included language similar to that used in the policies for the other protected areas in the County. Ms. Foley suggested that within developments, individual boat docks should be discouraged in favor of community docks.
- Discussed Policy 4.1.8. There was agreement with the language shown on the screen provided by Mr. Wood.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Ed Mitchell read a letter into the record from Friends of Ferndale, Inc. and asked that it be included in the public record.

Fred Cranmer read a letter into the record from Friends of Ferndale, Inc. and asked that it be included in the public record.

Nancy Fullerton, representing Alliance to Protect Water Resources (APWR), discussed the boundary of the LAPA and the Springshed for Gourd Neck Springs. She thought the current State requirements on shoreline clearing should be reviewed and said this may need to be re-addressed. She also addressed the difficulty of enacting the nuisance vegetation policies and the desirability of not allowing marinas on Lake Apopka.

Peggy Belflower said the current draft FLUE was not available on the County's website and she objected that the draft was not available to the public.

Ottmar Olsen said the "moving target" of the FLUM was adversely affecting his property rights and asked the LPA to transmit the FLUM. Mr. Olsen also acknowledged the hard work of the LPA.

Cecelia Bonifay, Akerman Senterfitt, said she represented several landowners in the County and had filed a Notice of Appearance previously. Ms. Bonifay said the Lake Apopka Development Guidelines have been followed and she thought that should allay many of the concerns about protecting this area. Ms. Bonifay was concerned about the land uses and regulations within several of the Joint Planning Areas (JPAs) and said those regulations would create more expense. Ms. Bonifay said they had been able to access the draft FLUE on the website.

Linda Stewart thought adequate time should be taken in order to protect the environment and allow for citizen input. She said the recent election reflected concern about environmental protection, and she suggested continuing this until the new commissioners are seated in November.

Bill Ray was concerned with the term "low intensity sustainable agriculture" used within the special protection areas. He said depending on how this was defined it could, in effect, eliminate many agricultural pursuits. Ms. Foley said the agriculture policies are directed towards lake protection and she didn't think it would preclude agricultural uses, only those uses which pollute the lake.

MOTION by Sean Parks, SECONDED by Nadine Foley to accept Goal 4 as amended.
FOR: Newman, Foley, Schue, Parks, Dunkel, Dupee, Jordan,
ABSENT: Carey, Elswick
AGAINST: None
MOTION PASSED: 7-0

There was a ten-minute break at 11:02 a.m.

Mr. Schue thought there were remaining FLUE issues to be discussed in order to ensure the utmost accuracy. He said he had discussed some of his comments with staff Friday and these were the written comments he had provided this morning. Wayne Bennett, AICP, Director of Planning, said staff has not had an opportunity to review or address these comments. He suggested the LPA consider these issues at a later date to allow for staff to review and evaluate the comments. Mr. Bennett said he could not speak for the BCC regarding the scheduled workshops. Ms. Foley said the LPA should "work on their own job" and not worry about the BCC workshops. The Chairman said these Goals have been voted on and disagreed with Mr. Schue's wanting to review them again. She also disagreed with materials being provided to the LPA for their decision on the meeting date.

MOTION by David Jordan, SECONDED by Sean Parks to support the recommendation of Mr. Bennett to allow time for staff to review the written comments submitted by Mr. Schue.

Mr. Dunkel thought discussion on the FLUM would be incomplete unless there was full agreement on the FLUE. There was discussion on the interconnection of the FLUE and FLUM. Mr. Dunkel thought more JPAs should be adopted before the FLUM was adopted. Mr. Jordan thought some issues and areas of FLUM could be agreed upon at this time. Mr. Schue restated his concerns.

FOR: **Newman, Parks, Dupee, Jordan,**
ABSENT: **Carey, Elswick**
AGAINST: **Schue, Foley, Dunkel**
MOTION PASSED: 4-3

Mr. Bennett said staff would like all LPA comments two weeks prior to the meeting at which they would be discussed. He said this would allow staff adequate review time and staff could provide the LPA with the meeting materials one week in advance of the meeting. After some discussion, a special meeting was scheduled on October 5, 2006, which makes September 21, 2006 the final deadline for comments on the FLUE. There was agreement that changes to the FLUE at the October 5th meeting could result in changes to the FLUM. Mr. Bennett discussed several options to review the FLUM and suggested taking public comment at the beginning of the discussion.

MOTION by David Jordan, SECONDED by Sean Parks to take public comments on the Future Land Use Map first and to schedule the comments by Planning Zones.

Mr. Dunkel questioned how many changes to land use would have to be made because of the number of annexations and commented on the subsequent increases in densities. He thought it was very important to know the population numbers and the land use inventory.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT
Ed Mitchell, Ferndale resident, discussed the actual densities in Ferndale and said he did not support the proposed densities of two and half residences per acre.

Vicki Zaneis said she was anxious to see the FLUM, so she could make comments. She was concerned with JPAs and annexations, particularly those close to Lake Harris in the Lady Lake area. She supported Greenbelt areas to protect the wildlife corridor along the Oklahawa River and Lake Griffin.

Ray Goodgame, City of Clermont council, discussed the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) population projections. He discussed the budget of the County Growth Management Department and questioned why new land uses and new FLUMs were being developed.

Jack Hogan, City of Clermont council, said he was very concerned about school overcrowding, overpopulation, inadequate facilities and urban sprawl. He believed that most residents wanted to "hold the line" on growth.

Mr. Dunkel said the Cities and the County needed to work together to control growth.

Darren Gray, Assistant City Manager, City of Clermont, discussed how the City had developed their land use recommendations. He showed a portion of the FLUM and discussed with some specificity the land uses the City had recommended. He said the City was concerned about the removal of the rural land uses in their JPA and that their recommendations were not on the FLUM.

Mr. Parks and Mr. Gray discussed the advantages of the Workplace District, including the requirement that the residential area is proportional to the work provided and that the commercial portion would be developed initially or simultaneously with the residential uses and the requirement for Small Area Plans.

Mayor Yatsuk, City of Mt. Dora, discussed the City's Resolution No. 2006-21. He said the City was concerned that the Rural Transitional Land Use as shown on the FLUM might lead people to believe that the one dwelling unit per acre "is a given." Mr. Schue and Mayor Yatsuk discussed the density that the City thought would be appropriate for the Baucom property.

Mr. Parks was very concerned about an area near the Wolf Branch Sink that was designated industrial. Mr. Yatsuk said the City believed those uses could be less 'harmful' to the sink because they are subject to more regulations than residential. Mr.

Parks was still concerned about protecting that area.

Brenda DeMarco, Mt. Dora City Council, said the City felt strongly about their recommendation for one dwelling unit per five acres in the JPA, North and East of Mt. Dora, and did not agree with the higher density shown on the proposed FLUM. She discussed the importance the City has placed on smart growth principles and protecting the unique character of their City.

Mark Reggintin, Planning Director, City of Mt. Dora, discussed the land uses and characteristics of their JPA. He said the City viewed the Office District with office or research uses, possibly with light manufacturing associated with the office or research and supporting commercial uses. He said they did not envision any residential uses in that area.

Elaine Renick, Clermont City Council, said Clermont did not intend to have increased densities in their JPA and said they had viewed the JPA boundary as a rural boundary. The City wanted to create a sense of place.

Judy Proli, Clermont resident, said she favored slow growth and was opposed to the Karlton project. She said the rapid growth in the County had adversely affected the school system, created congested roads and placed a heavy burden on services.

Ken LaRoe asked about an area with a commercial designation by Wyguel Road, north of Umatilla. And Ms. Foley said it was the spray field for the Golden Gem citrus plant. He referred to an area in the Wekiva Study Area for which the City of Eustis had proposed 25% open space, however, he said a study had recommended 50-80% open space in that same area. He commented that there were no representatives from the City of Eustis present.

Janet Shira, B & H Consultants, said she was the planning consultant for the City of Mascotte. She said that although County staff agreed with the City's recommendations, they were not shown on the FLUM. She discussed land uses the City would like adjacent to their boundaries including some rural areas and some infill areas designated as Mixed-Use. In response to a question from Ms. Foley, Mr. Bennett said the TN district replaced the Mixed-Use District from the current Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Schue and Ms. Shira discussed the importance of locating employment opportunities close to residential areas.

Robert Curry discussed the issue of commercial uses in the Wekiva River Protection Area (WRPA). He said there were inconsistencies between the commercial location criteria, the WRPA policies and the FLUM. He thought the commercial text would be adequate, but didn't think commercial uses in the Wekiva area should be designated on the map. Mr. Curry suggested creating a general Future Land Use category for uses that are allowed in both rural and urban areas, such as commercial, public and conservation lands.

Kathy Allison, paralegal with Akerman Senterfitt, thought the LPA should move forward

with the FLUM because the delay was adversely affecting property rights. She said it was important for the plan to be financially feasible. She said rules and regulations are proposed that exceed those of the State and Federal governments. She thought there should be more balance between property rights and protection of the environment.

Cindy Terrapani, planner with Florida Design Consultants, said she represents Woodlands at Church Lake. She said that community is opposed to the Traditional Neighborhood and Low Density Residential land uses proposed for their property. Ms. Terrapani said they are requesting Medium Density Residential land use.

Rob Kelly, President of Citizen Coalition of Lake County (CCLC), discussed some discrepancies he saw on the FLUM, such as the lack of overlay depiction, the EMPA boundaries, Ocala Forest Protection Area and the rural overlay. He thought it was important to restore some of the rural areas.

Terry Godts was concerned that the Green Swamp boundaries had been replaced with a reference to the States boundaries and rules. She said it has been rumored that some Areas of Critical State Concern may be de-designated. She thought the boundary description should be restored to the Plan and to the policies.

Clif Whitaker discussed property owned by his family, the Eichelberger and the Bartlett families in the Grand Island area. He said the area surrounding these properties have been developed at higher densities than what they are requesting. He said this is the third time he has appeared before the LPA and he remains concerned about their property rights being adversely affected.

Fred Cranmer said true rural villages have a mix of residential densities with village oriented commercial and retail, plus active farming uses. He said the densities on the FLUM are different from both the existing densities and the desires of the residents. He was concerned about protecting Ferndale until the Historic Village Overlay is in place. He wanted the Ferndale area removed from the Montverde JPA map. He said the boundaries shown on the FLUM are inaccurate. He thought the draft Comprehensive Plan transmittal should be deferred until the new commissioners are seated on the BCC.

Jack Champion said he purchased property on Britt Road, which had a density of one dwelling unit per acre. Several days later the density was changed to one dwelling unit per five acres. He said there are higher densities adjacent to and in close proximity to this property. His request is for one dwelling unit per acre with 50% open space.

Hugh Kent commented on the JPA process and suggested showing the cities' recommendations as a "default" and then discussing the uses the County was recommending. He discussed the Eustis JPA and asked to have a map put into the record showing changes to their JPA.

Bill Ray said he was a planner with Boyer, Singelton and Associates. He thought it was time to move forward with the FLUM or to notify the BCC that a consensus had not been

reached. Mr. Ray discussed the need for a "net map" and said they should plan for an adequate inventory of land. He was concerned about the cost of implementing the draft policies. He discussed what he called "rural sprawl," which he defined as residents on larger rural lots that demand urban services.

Peggy Belflower referred to the FLUM dated September 11th and said the Pier 44 area is still shown as rural.

Pete Alvarado said he was speaking on behalf of the Bartletts, who owned property close to that of Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Echelberger. He said the surrounding areas had been developed at higher densities than that shown on their properties. He thought the lowering of densities and the elimination of timeliness was in effect a "taking" of their property rights.

Egor Emory said he would like to see a correct FLUM so changes to it could be discussed. He spoke in favor of a including a "sunset clause" associated with re-zonings in the Comprehensive Plan to prevent a repeat of the Sugar Loaf Mountain situation.

Ms. King said she was facilitating discussions on the FLUM with each of the municipalities. She said staff is working to update all of the annexations on the FLUM. She said some city recommendations have changed over time and more changes will be forthcoming.

There was discussion about whether to continue posting all of the Comprehensive Plan data on the website. Mr. Jordan believed some individuals have difficulty navigating websites and then think data is not there. Ms. King said most jurisdictions do not provide as much information as Lake County has been providing. She said material was posted in as timely as a manner as possible, however, if it is confusing to the public it could be discontinued. Chairman Newman believed that many of the comments made on the availability of data were not fair and said it was a convenience to the public not a requirement.

Mr. Schue questioned some of the changes on the FLUM in the Eustis area. Mr. Bennett said there had been recent communication with Eustis, it was his understanding that an agreement had been reached. Ms. King said she had been aware of some errors and said Mr. Roane had issues he wanted to discuss but was out of town at this time. She said all the municipalities would be invited to attend another LPA meeting

There was a one-hour break for lunch at 1:30 p.m. and the meeting resumed at 2:30 p.m.

FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FLUM)

Mr. Bennett said Planning Zone 10, which includes the Clermont area, would be discussed first.

MOTION by Keith Schue to restore the Rural Future Land Use on the Karlton

Property until a consensus is reached with the City of Clermont.
Motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. King said the City of Clermont had requested areas outside of their JPA remain rural. Mr. Gray said the City Council had recommended the Karlton property remain rural, that the TN area in the JPA area stay rural and discussed other City recommendations. Mr. Schue discussed the importance of cooperating with Clermont and suggested a "summit" with the City before designating urban uses in that area.

Ms. Dupee said it was important to create job opportunities in the County. She discussed some of the positive elements of the Karlton Village proposal such as creation of good jobs, the proximity to the town center of Horizons West and an improved transportation corridor. Ms. Dupee said not all of the cities want higher densities near their boundaries and she questioned locating employment areas close to rural areas.

Mr. Parks stated the Small Area Plan (SAP) required by the WD land use would be the equivalent of a "summit." He listed some of the advantages of WD over a simple re-zoning, including requirements for open space, internal capture rate and the Leadership Energy Environmental Design (LEED) standards. He said this designation could create better employment opportunities.

David Jordan returned to the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

MOTION by Sean Parks, SECONDED by Nadine Foley to designate the Future Land Use for the Karlton Property as Workplace District.

Ms. Foley discussed the benefits of the WD and said it was important to consider the adjacent land use in Orange County, which is Horizons West. She understood that Clermont would like to have lower densities as a buffer between the Karlton property and the City. She thought it was best, in areas outside of a JPA, to plan for what is best for the County in the long term. She supported the WD land use on the Karlton property and in the "blade" area of Clermont's JPA. She, also supported Clermont's request for one dwelling to five acres and the other densities on their map.

Mr. Schue said 25% of a development in that land use could be residential with a possible density of twelve dwelling units per acre. And he questioned if it was the County's role for it to be the 15th city. He believed this should not go forward because of the dissension caused by this project.

Mr. Parks said the SAP would create a consensus between the interested parties and discussed the rules on the timing of residential uses within the WD.

Mr. Jordan said the area was rural and the residents wanted it to remain rural. He was concerned about the hydrological issues in that area. He didn't believe Horizons West should be a consideration and he believed there should be a place to draw the line on development.

Mr. Schue said it was important to have a consensus with Clermont before decisions are made.

Ms. Foley thought in this particular situation it was important to "look across the border" and to consider the Horizons West development. She said without a plan this area would develop piecemeal and that would not be good.

Mr. Dunkel felt they still needed more information on the FLUM to know how "aggressive" they needed to be on densities. He said it took more than designating land uses to create employment opportunities. Mr. Schue was concerned about the structure of the SAP process. He thought a summit with Clermont and possibly Orange County should be held prior to putting this land use designation on the FLUM. Ms. Dupee discussed the economic changes in the County created by the citrus freezes. She said there was little land suitable for industry because of the lack of central utilities. Mr. Jordan discussed the build-out figure and how the statutes restrict the ability of communities to plan and to create a vision for their future.

Mr. Gray discussed the community input in opposition to the Karlton project during the LPA meeting held at Clermont City hall.

Mr. Parks restated the motion: to designate what was formerly the Karlton tract as Workplace District.

FOR:	**Newman, Foley, Parks, Dupee**
ABSENT:	**Carey, Elswick**
AGAINST:	**Dunkel, Jordan, Schue**
MOTION PASSED:	**4-3**

In response to Mr. Bennett's question, there was agreement that the motion applied only to the Karlton tract and didn't include land within the Clermont JPA. Mr. Jordan said he thought the motion applied to land outside the Karlton tract. To further clarify the motion, a boundary map of Karlton from the land use change application was shown on the screen.

MOTION by Ann Dupee to include "the finger" area of the Clermont JPA as Workplace District. Motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Foley thought the land use recommendations of Clermont in their JPA should be followed. Mr. Bennett suggested discussing those recommendations and the City's comments on the WD at another meeting. Mr. Jordan said the motion on the Karlton tract contradicted the recommendations of Clermont.

MOTION by Nadine Foley, SECONDED by Sean Parks to recognize the City of Clermont's recommendation for the one dwelling unit per five acres within their JPA.

In order to clarify a legal question, Mr. Minkoff said changes in Future Land Use designations do not create a legal basis for a "taking" issue. He said a "taking" often requires more than a zoning issue, such as a Development Order (DO) or reliance on a DO. He said in general, Comprehensive Plan changes are not grounds for a "taking."

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

As a point of clarification, Ms. King commented it was staff's intention that publicly owned conservation lands or governmental use land would remain designated Public, Quasi-Public.

Mr. Bennett said he would like the LPAs position made clear for the record and Mr. Gray outlined three areas recognizing the LPA's agreement with Clermont's recommendations. The first two were the commercial areas south of Hwy 50 and west of CR 455 plus the area on the north side of Hook Street. The third area was to be a mixed-use He said he would consult with the City Council on the WD and TN.

Mr. Schue said the commercial and office land use categories contain an allowance for high-density residential. And he stated that he disagreed with allowing residential with those uses.

MOTION by Nadine Foley, SECONDED by Ann Dupee to adopt the commercial recommendations of Clermont on parcels south of Hwy 50, north of Hook Street.

Mr. Schue asked for a consensus by the LPA that commercial uses will be non-residential, not mixed-use. Mr. Bennett said it had been voted earlier to defer that discussion, he said staff needed time to review this topic. Mr. Schue said it had been decided that commercial and office uses were to be straight, non-residential categories. Mr. Gray said Clermont would not support mixed-uses in commercial and office uses.

MOTION by Sean Parks, SECONDED BY David Jordan to table the motion to the next meeting on October 5, 2006.

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

After some discussion, Mr. Bennett said that a "running total of the changes" to the FLUM could be provided to the LPA.

Ms. King said the area west of Highway 27 was unchanged and identified the vested Development of Regional Impact (DRI), which is Cagan's Crossing. She said the DRI (west of Highway 27) referred to by Mr. Schue, was shown with that particular color/land

use because the LPA had agreed that no changes would be made in the Green Swamp. There was discussion on the timing of that DRI and the future land use. Ms. Foley thought all of the Green Swamp categories should remain the same. Mr. Bennett said that property had been designated Urban 22 and that land use was unchanged. He said staff would include a definition of that particular land use in the FLUE draft. Mr. Jordan said it had been the general consensus that the Future Land Use should follow parcel lines as much as possible. Mr. Bennett said that issue would be addressed in the Rules of Interpretation.

Mr. Bennett said the motion dealt only with the Karlton tract, anything not included in that tract will remain as it is shown unless the LPA decides otherwise. Mr. Schue questioned the land uses shown in the area south of Karlton and Mr. Jordan said the review of that area is not complete and said staff would do more research. Mr. Parks commented that changes in the FLUE could result in map modifications.

There was general agreement that the review of Planning Zone 10 by the LPA was concluded as much as possible at this time.

MT. DORA AREA
Mr. Reggintin reprised the remaining issues, the area west of Britt Road is designated Low Density Residential (LDR) on the proposed FLUM but is Rural on the current FLUM, and the City was recommending that area remain Rural. It is the recommendation of the City of Mt. Dora that the area within their JPA designated Rural, remain Rural.

MOTION by Nadine Foley, SECONDED by Richard Dunkel to retain the Rural designation that the City of Mt. Dora has requested (west of Britt Road).

Mr. Reggintin said the City Council was satisfied with the parcel lines on the last map they saw. Mr. Schue said some of the area included in the motion was outside the Mt. Dora JPA area. There was discussion on the land uses in areas located in both the Wekiva Protection Area and the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning area. Mr. Reggintin outlined the Mt. Dora JPA on a FLUM.

AMENDED MOTION by Nadine Foley, SECONDED by David Jordan that the motion shall include the area within the Mt. Dora JPA but not the area included in the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Overlay.

Mr. Schue said this area west of Britt Road was adjacent to a Pringle Development and yet it was proposed for rural density.

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

Ms. Foley restated the Motion that the City of Mt. Dora's recommendation for the rural land use in their JPA, but excluding the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Overlay, be accepted.

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

MOTION by David Jordan, SECONDED by Ann Dupee to accept public comment at this time.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill Holler said he owned property near Goose Prairie Road and CR 452, which is surrounded by property owned by the Whitakers, the Bartletts and the Eichelbergers. He said that particular property had been designated as a Rural Village and now because that designation had been removed, he felt there was a loss of value on his property.

Lowrie Brown said he wanted to discuss his property on SR 44. He said there was quite a bit of development in that area, plus the potential of central utilities. And he disagreed with the Rural land use being proposed for his property. In response to a question from Mr. Jordan, Mr. Brown said the property currently had a Rural future land use designation.

Peggy Belflower said the Karlton Property had been designated as Workplace District, however, she said in the current draft only the residential categories were defined.

John Broutcheck said he owns a single property on Britt Road with two different proposed land uses. He said he had consulted with several planners and still had no resolution on this. He said this was a "taking" and his only recourse might be legal action. Mr. Jordan clarified as follows: that the staff draft map showed one density and the City of Mt. Dora had recommended a lower density, which the LPA agreed to in the earlier motion. He said the landowner was requesting a higher density than the one he had now. Mr. Broutcheck thought land uses should be consistent based on the property owner's boundaries. He didn't understand how a contiguous parcel could have two separate land uses and said he wanted the higher density assigned to all of his land. There was discussion on that motion. Mr. Bennett said some of Mr. Brautcheck's property was one dwelling unit per five acres, Rural, and some was Rural Transitional, which, with clustering, could potentially have densities of one dwelling unit per one acre. Mr. Schue thought the city and the county should discuss further the area west of Britt Road. Mr. Brautcheck reiterated his comment regarding two land uses on one contiguous parcel.

Jack Champion said he owns land west of Britt Road and in the Mt. Dora JPA, and adjacent to the Lakes of Mt. Dora. He said the density was one dwelling unit per acre then, only thirteen days after he purchased it, the City of Mt. Dora requested a change to one dwelling unit per five acres.

Mr. Bennett said the September 21, 2006 meeting would not include discussion on the FLUM. Ms. Stricklin discussed agenda items scheduled for that meeting. She said staff would update the BCC tomorrow, and there would not be a substantive update unless it is requested by the BCC.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:12 p.m.

Donna R. Bohrer	Keith Schue
Office Associate III	Secretary