A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

JANUARY 6, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, January 6, 2026 at 9:00 a.m., in the County Commission Chambers, Lake County Administration Building, Tavares, Florida. Commissioners present at the meeting were: Leslie Campione, Chairman; Sean Parks, Vice Chairman; Kirby Smith; and Timothy Morris. Commissioner not present: Anthony Sabatini. Others present were: Jennifer Barker, County Manager; Melanie Marsh, County Attorney; Misty Spahn, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office; Gary J. Cooney, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller; Kristy Mullane, Chief Financial Officer; and Stephanie Cash, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Commr. Campione welcomed everyone to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting.

Pastor Chase Allen, with First Baptist Church of Umatilla, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, mentioned that Commissioner Sabatini was not in attendance on the current day and had requested to participate remotely because he had been called away to serve in his capacity as a member of the National Guard. She related that in order for him to participate and vote remotely, the Board would have to vote for approval to add an emergency agenda item, and that it would require a second vote to approve Commissioner Sabatini's remote participation.

Commr. Smith asked if he was able to be online.

Ms. Barker commented that he was not currently signed in.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to add an emergency agenda item to allow Commissioner Sabatini to vote remotely.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to allow Commissioner Sabatini to vote remotely.

MINUTES APPROVAL

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the minutes for the BCC meeting of November 18, 2025 (Regular Meeting) as presented.

CITIZEN QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD

Commr. Campione remarked that anyone who had joined the meeting through Zoom using their phone may press *9 to virtually raise their hand, and that anyone participating on Zoom could click the raise hand button to identify that they wished to speak. She added that everyone would have three minutes to speak, and that after three minutes, an alarm would sound to let them know that their time was up.

Ms. Patty Kendrick, a resident of Lake County, stated that she had sent emails to the BCC regarding development and other concerns, and that she had attended a town hall meeting for the 2050 Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan), noting that she did not know what the summary of the survey was. She expressed concerns about overdevelopment, traffic, recycling, and water testing in the lakes, and inquired if she could obtain answers to her questions.

Commr. Campione commented that she could email her, noting that she had taken notes of the concerns raised on the current day.

Ms. Kathryn Wright, a resident of the Town of Lady Lake, indicated concerns about growth, and stated that according to the National Integrated Drought Information System, Lake County was in its sixth driest year in the past 131 years from January 2025 through November 2025, noting that the amount of area in Lake County that was abnormally dry was 97.63 percent. She opined that the development was going to add to this issue, and asked for a moratorium. She mentioned that she loved the water and quality of life, and said that she did not want to be flooded or have wells drying up due to rapid development.

Ms. Cindy Newton, a concerned citizen, remarked that Senate Bill (SB) 208 would limit what local governments could do and take away more control over development, and that this was going to be on the judiciary committee agenda to be heard on January 12, 2026, as it had already gone through its first committee. She hoped that she could bring attention to this issue, and urged people to write to their legislative representatives.

Mr. Brandon Hartzog, a resident of the Paisley area, related that he had emailed his County Commissioner and the Lake County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) about the unsafe speed of the LCSO cars in the Paisley area, which he opined were going 100 miles per hour through a school zone. He also expressed concern that he had not received a certification from a class he took with the County, and said that his emails inquiring about it had not been answered. He then indicated concern that the playground equipment was being removed from the County's park in the Paisley area and being replaced with a smaller playset, which he opined would not be sufficient.

Commr. Campione relayed that when she received a message about the LCSO, she reached out to them, noting that she did not have jurisdiction over the LCSO. She commented that the North Lake Park was a phenomenal park that served a large number of residents and children in Lake County, and that she had confidence in the Office of Parks and Trails staff to evaluate equipment; furthermore, she spent much time in the Astor area and worked hard to address concerns within the purview and jurisdiction of the BCC.

Ms. Stephanie Burgess, a resident of Lake County, stated that the Heritage Green development was 217 acres and would be built in the Wolf Branch Road/Round Lake Road/Scenic Hills Drive area, and pointed out that this was an agricultural area with two and five acre lots and livestock. She opined that there was no infrastructure for this development, and that they did not know if the City of Mount Dora would provide utilities because there was no contiguous infrastructure for that. She indicated concerns about gopher tortoises, the density, the lack of emergency access, waiting lists for schools, disruption to the agricultural community, flooding issues, added traffic, and the topography of the site, which she opined made it unbuildable.

Commr. Campione relayed that the Public Works Department was working on an overall plan that would reconfigure a larger drainage area and culverts underneath Round Lake Road, and that after they repaired Wolf Branch Road, they would focus on keeping water off that intersection. She mentioned that the BCC had previously denied this project, and that the developer had lowered their numbers and was currently in a different review process. She suggested that Ms. Burgess write to the County Manager so that her concerns would go directly to the staff that were looking at the road connections and technical issues, noting that they would also be looking at the species reports.

Ms. Burgess inquired who the project handler would be, noting that she had tried to contact Ms. Janie Barrón.

Ms. Barker replied that Ms. Barrón was a Chief Planner for the Office of Planning and Zoning; however, if Mr. Burgess would send her concerns to her, she would ensure that it reached the appropriate staff.

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT AND COMPTROLLER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller's Consent Agenda, Items 1 through 3, as follows:

List of Warrants

Notice is hereby provided of warrants paid prior to this meeting, pursuant to Chapter 136.06 (1) of the Florida Statutes, which shall be incorporated into the Minutes as attached Exhibit A and filed in the Board Support Division of the Clerk's Office.

Amended Budget for the Cascades at Groveland CDD

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Amended Budget for the Cascades at Groveland Community Development District.

Lands Available List

Notice is hereby provided of having received a list of property placed on the Lands Available List.

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the Consent Agenda, Tabs 3 through 7, pulling Tab 4 to the regular agenda, as follows:

PUBLIC SAFETY

Fire Rescue

Recommend retroactive approval of an agreement with AdventHealth to receive funding to support Lake County Emergency Medical Services (EMS). The fiscal impact is $50,000 (revenue/expenditure).

INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Facilities Management

Recommend approval of a Settlement Agreement with Blackwater Construction Services, LLC, to terminate Contract 23-905 for turn-key construction services related to the renovation and addition to Fire Station 91, located at 746 Albrook Street in Mascotte. Commission District 1.

There is no fiscal impact.

Public Works

Recommend approval:

1. Of a Local Agency Program (LAP) agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT);

2. To adopt supporting Resolution 2026-1 with FDOT for funding the Right of Way acquisition of Log House Road (Pine Ridge Elementary School) from CR 561 to Lakeshore Drive;

3. To adopt Unanticipated Revenue Resolution 2026-2 (URR) adding $150,000 to the Federal/State Grants Fund for the right of way acquisition services for the Log House Road Project; and

4. Of a budget transfer in the amount of $22,758 from Sidewalks to Easements/ROW Log House Rd (Pine Ridge Elem).

The estimated fiscal impact is $172,758 — $150,000 (revenue/expenditure — grant funded) and $22,758 (expenditure — county match). Commission District 1.

Recommend approval:

1. Of a Local Agency Program (LAP) agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT);

2. To adopt supporting Resolution 2026-3 with FDOT for Planning and Environmental Analysis Services (PD&E) for the Rolling Acres Road PD&E Study from south of CR 466 to north of US27/US441;

3. To adopt Unanticipated Revenue Resolution 2026-4 (URR) adding $450,000 to the Federal/State Grants Fund for the Rolling Acres Road PD&E Project; and

4. Of a budget transfer in the amount of $450,000 from Easements/ROW to Infrastructure-Studies Rolling Acres Rd CR466 - US27/441.

The estimated fiscal impact is $900,000 — $450,000 (revenue/expenditure - grant funded) and $450,000 (expenditure - county match). Commission District 1 and 2.

TAB 4: SUBORDINATION AGREEMENT FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Vance Jochim, a concerned citizen, remarked that the current item asked the Board to approve a waiver of $848,000 for a developer's construction of an affordable housing project, and that even though there was legislation allowing them to do that, the amount was not described in the agenda, noting that it only said that there was no fiscal impact at this time. He stated that he disagreed with this statement, and opined that there were times when the County hid the total value of some decisions, which he opined should be on the agenda. He expressed concerns about reports of government fraud, and said that he was frustrated by the lack of oversight. He opined that the Inspector General should be auditing the Constitutional Officers, and that the County should start addressing oversight. He opined that the County should have the controls in place in case the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) for the State of Florida audited Lake County, and that the County should have a full review of its spending, including procurement and waivers.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, explained that there was no fiscal impact on the current item because it was for a subordination agreement, and that the Board had already reviewed this project twice. She elaborated that on May 20, 2025, the Board reviewed all of the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee recommendations, and that this project was chosen out of all the people asking for impact fee waivers for housing purposes. She commented that the agenda item at that time would have been detailed, as was the Board discussion, and included the following

approvals: a school impact waiver of $800,000; a fire impact fee waiver in the amount of $50,824; and library impact fees in the amount of $27,450. She pointed out that the transportation impact fee waivers were denied, and that the developer would be paying transportation impact fees. She remarked that this came back to the Board on July 22, 2025 for a review and approval of the agreement with the vendor, and that there was further discussion at that time. She mentioned that this was a final item for a subordination agreement that was required by the primary lender, which was a Fannie Mae lender, and that the County was not able to make significant changes to the subordination agreement because this project was receiving Federal and State funding, noting that the County was in about sixth position. She related that since all of those other funding sources were affordable housing funding sources, this project would be monitored by Federal and State agencies for compliance; additionally, some restrictive covenants would be filed when the County closed on the loan, requiring the developer to maintain this as an affordable housing project. She reiterated that the current item was just a consent agenda item to approve a subordination agreement, and that the language of the document could not be amended much because it was a Federal form required through Fannie Mae.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that according to the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, this was an opportunity for the County to assist with a project that was geared towards particular income levels, and that the County's loan was not in first position.

Ms. Marsh clarified that the County was in fifth or sixth position.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that in the past, these projects had to set aside a significant amount of funds in reserves to assure ongoing maintenance and operation, and that there would be a funding level for 20 to 30 years to keep them in good condition, to ensure that they were not a blight on the community, and to provide availability for people to have attainable rent.

Ms. Marsh said that this was correct, and reiterated that they were receiving significant funding from Federal and State agencies, noting that the developer would have to comply with all of those requirements.

Commr. Smith commented that the agenda mentioned a request for the County to accept the subordination agreement without staff-recommended changes, and he questioned what the staff-recommended changes were.

Ms. Marsh answered that they were minor wording changes for collection purposes; however, since the County was taking such a low position, it would not matter if there was a default because the State or Federal agencies would take priority. She remarked that the risk was very low, which was why they were bringing it forward.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the following items: a Subordination Agreement related to the Agreement between Lake County and ECG Florida 2023 III, LP, for Affordable Housing Multi-Family Impact Fee Waiver for the Urick Street Apartments Project; for the County Manager to execute the Subordination Agreement substantially similar to the form attached upon finalization of the construction and conversion of the project from a construction loan to a permanent loan,

with review and approval of the County Attorney's Office; and for the County Manager to execute future Subordination Agreements related to other Affordable Housing Multi-Family Impact Fee Waiver projects, with review and approval of the County Attorney's Office.

SECOND PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE AMENDING ZONING DISTRICT USE REGULATIONS

Ms. Marsh placed the proposed ordinance on the floor for reading by title only as follows:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS OF THE LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS: CHAPTER II, ENTITLED DEFINITIONS, SECTION 3.01.02, ENTITLED ZONING DISTRICT USE REGULATIONS; SECTION 3.01.03, ENTITLED SCHEDULE OF PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL USES; SECTION 3.01.04, ENTITLED KEY TO CONDITIONS IN TABLE OF PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL USES; ALLOWING CHICKEN FARMS, EGG-PROCESSING FACILITIES, HOG FARMS, MILLS, RIDING STABLES, SLAUGHTER HOUSES, AND FARMWORKER HOUSING AS A PERMITTED USE IN THE AGRICULTURE (A) ZONING DISTRICT; CREATING SECTION 3.03.00 TO ESTABLISH MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR THESE USES; ADJUSTING THE ZONING MATRIX TO COMPLY WITH SECTION 125.01055, FLORIDA STATUTES, REGARDING ALLOWABLE USES UNDER THE LIVE LOCAL LAW; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR FILING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Ms. Marsh pointed out that this was the second and final reading on this document, and that the errata sheet was contained in the packet showing the changes the Board had requested during the first reading, which changed the buffer language to include the following: a minimum buffer of 50 feet along all property boundaries would be required; only the portion of the buffers set forth shall require landscaping where it was buffering up against a different use about 10 to 20 feet while the remainder of the 50 foot buffer would be in its natural state; and the fee for a variance would be 50 percent of what was shown in the fee schedule if a variance was sought, so that agricultural uses seeking a buffer variance would pay a lower fee.

Commr. Parks inquired if Commissioner Sabatini was online yet, and Ms. Barker indicated that he was not. Commissioner Parks proposed that since Commissioner Sabatini was not available for Tabs 8 and 9, then they should be tabled, noting that it could be read and explained so that everybody could hear it and public comment could be given; however, he opined that since they were important ordinance changes, all Commissioners should be present to vote.

Commr. Smith stated that he was in favor of tabling Tabs 8 and 9, opining that it was a good idea to have all five Commissioners in attendance for the discussion. He mentioned that he would like those who had attended the BCC meeting to comment on any of these two items, and that it could be tabled after the discussion.

Commr. Campione opined that it was a good solution, and that since Tab 8 was a Land Development Regulations (LDR) change, it was very important, as was Tab 9.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to table this item.

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE AMENDING WELLNESS WAY LANDSCAPING REGULATIONS

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to table an Ordinance amending Section 16.00.02, Lake County Code, Appendix E, Land Development Regulations (LDR), entitled Wellness Way Development Standards regarding Landscaping Regulations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: REZONING

REZONING CONSENT AGENDA

Commr. Campione reminded the Board that they were required to disclose any communications they may have had with the applicant or members of the public about any zoning case on the agenda. She asked the Board, at the start of each case, to state on the record the names of the persons they spoke to and the subject matter of the discussions. She commented that any written correspondence had already been placed in the file by staff, and that they also needed to disclose any site visits.

Commr. Parks stated that he met with the applicants for the Lake Yale Planned Unit Development (PUD), and that he worked with staff on Tabs 4 and 5.

Commr. Campione commented that she met with the planner and engineer of the Whitaker property for the Lake Yale PUD to review transportation issues, and that she met onsite with the property owner to tour the property and discuss the design proposals and density.

Commr. Smith remarked that he had met with the attorney and applicant for the Lake Yale PUD, noting that the Board had also received emails.

Commr. Morris relayed that he had also met with representatives for the Lake Yale PUD.

Commr. Campione mentioned that Tab 10 was regarding a proposed development agreement and addendum for the Lake Yale PUD, opining that those could be all be heard together.

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, stated that he could address the developers agreement first per the agenda or combine it with Tabs 2 and 3 on the rezoning agenda.

Ms. Marsh recommended that the Lake Yale PUD items be done at the same time.

Commr. Campione related that the Board would hear the development agreement with Tabs 2 and 3 of the rezoning agenda, and that the meeting would proceed with Tab 1 of the rezoning agenda.

Mr. Fitzgerald displayed the advertisements for that day's rezoning cases on the overhead monitor in accordance with the Florida Statutes. He said that Tab 1 was rezoning case # PZ2025-156, Rafiki Foundation Portable Classrooms, which was on the consent agenda.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding any cases on the Rezoning Consent Agenda, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the Rezoning Consent Agenda Tab 1, as follows:

Tab 1. Ordinance No. 2026-1
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-156
Rafiki Foundation Portable Classrooms
Amend Community Facility District Ordinance #2015-47 to allow for the development of five (5) K – 8 classrooms, remove the housing for retired missionaries, and rescind/replace Ordinance #2015-47 with a new Ordinance.

REZONING REGULAR AGENDA

Tab 2.
Rezoning Case # PZ2023-235
Lake Yale PUD (FLUM)
Amend the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) to change the Future Land Use Category (FLUC) on approximately 208.56+/- acres from Rural Transition FLUC to Urban Low Density FLUC, along with neighboring parcels, allow for zoning of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to accommodate a mixed-use development including 1,150 active-adult residential units, 450 single-family and multi-family units, 100,000 square feet of commercial uses, and associated recreational facilities.

Tab 3.
Rezoning Case # PZ2023-236
Lake Yale PUD (RZ)
Rezone 456.48 +/- acres from Agriculture (A), Rural Residential (R-1), and Estate Residential (R-2) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to facilitate the development program for a mixed-use development including 1,150 active adult residential units, 450 multi-family and single-family units, and 100,000 square feet of commercial uses with associated recreational facilities.

Tab 4.
Rezoning Case # PZ2024-218
O'Brien Road PUD
Amend the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) to change the Future Land Use Category (FLUC) on approximately 68.31 +/- acres from Rural to Planned Unit Development to facilitate the development program for O'Brien Road Planned Unit Development, a 41-unit single-family residential subdivision.
Tab 5. Ordinance No. 2026-4
Rezoning Case # PZ2023-318
Butler Property (CUP)
Conditional use permit (CUP) approval on approximately 2.46 +/- acres to allow a fishing resort / small-scale recreational camp within the Rural Residential District (R-1).

LAKE YALE PUD

Mr. Fitzgerald presented Tab 2, Rezoning Case # PZ2023-235, Lake Yale PUD (FLUM), and said that the requested action was to amend the future land use (FLU) map on approximately 208.5 acres from Rural Transition to Urban Low to accommodate a mixed-use development, which included 1,150 active-adult residential units, 450 single-family and multi-family units, and 100,000 square feet of commercial uses and associated recreational facilities, noting that the Planning and Zoning Board had approved this item on the regular agenda. He mentioned that the location was north of CR 452 and south of Lake Yale in the Grand Island area, and that this request was compliant with the Comp Plan, as it was proposing a traditional neighborhood pursuant to policy I-1.3.1. He explained that it included an urban neighborhood that allowed golf carts on the public streets, which would be maintained by a community development district (CDD), a

municipal services taxing unit (MSTU), or a municipal service benefit unit (MSBU). He relayed that the development did not propose any industrial, manufacturing, or office uses, and he showed maps of the current FLU, the proposed FLU, and a conceptual plan of the phasing of the development. He commented that the proposed development would be about four dwelling units per net acre, and that the request was consistent with the Comp Plan in the FLU category that stated that Urban Low should be located in proximity to collector and arterial roads, which it was, noting that it was located in proximity to CR 452. He remarked that the City of Eustis had indicated that central water and central sewer were available to the subject property, and believed that it was the intent of the developer to run City services to this project. He related that school concurrency would be required, and that a proportionate share mitigation agreement may be necessary at the time of development. He stated that as the state of transportation concurrency was reviewed, it was determined that the impact to CR 452 would reduce it to a level of service "F", and that at the public hearing for this item on September 10, 2024, it was requested that the developer come back to the Board with a developers agreement for transportation improvements because of this issue. He explained that this was Tab 10 on the current day's agenda, and that the developers agreement for the Lake Yale PUD illustrated mitigation to the project's traffic impacts. He pointed out that they had agreed to the following items: extending the existing turn lanes on the southbound approach at the CR 44 and CR 452 intersection, including a 300-foot extension of the left turn lane and a 150-foot extension of the right turn lane; resurface and widen Apiary Road for approximately 3,800 linear feet from its intersection with CR 452 to the intersection of CR 44; construct a traffic signal at the intersection of CR 44 and Apiary Road; construct a roundabout at the intersection of CR 452 and the main entrance of the Lake Yale PUD, which was likely Apiary Road, noting that if a roundabout proved impractical, then a traffic signal would be installed; and construct a roundabout at the intersection of CR 452 and the second entrance, likely South Fish Camp Road, noting that if a roundabout proved impractical, then a traffic signal would be installed. He mentioned that the estimated construction cost of the improvements was $4.6 million, and that the estimated impact fee credits would be approximately $3 million, resulting in a net infrastructure investment by the developer of $1.6 million. He then relayed that Tab 3, Rezoning Case #PZ2023-236, Lake Yale PUD (RZ), was the companion ordinance to the FLU amendment, and that the requested action was to rezone 456.5 acres from Agriculture, Rural Residential (R-1), and Estate Residential (R-2) to PUD to facilitate a mixed-use development, which included 1,150 active adult residential units, 450 multi-family and single-family units, and 100,000 square feet of commercial space, and he showed an aerial map of the property, the current zoning of Agriculture and R-2, the proposed zoning of PUD, and the conceptual plan. He commented that the conceptual plan was consistent with the LDR, as it proposed complimentary and compatible commercial uses, which were permitted in a PUD zoning, and that it would promote a functional compatibility of uses and a safe and efficient circulation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. He stated that it was compliant with the Comp Plan, as it promoted a traditional neighborhood design (TND), which encouraged a mixed-use compact design, efficient use of services, and a diversification and integration of land uses. He related that it supported commercial uses, recreational opportunities,

and a diverse housing choice, and that it would include dark-sky lighting, Florida Friendly landscaping, garages that were set back from the front façade of the home, and driveways that were at least 25 feet deep so that parked cars would not block the sidewalks. He remarked that the property was located along CR 452 where the future Lake Yale Loop Trail would be located, noting that the trail location had yet to be determined. He mentioned that if this was approved and moved to site plan review and subdivision review, then they would take the trail into consideration, and noted that the applicant was in attendance to make a presentation.

Commr. Campione commented that Mr. Jeff Earhart, Engineering Director for the Public Works Department, was listed on Tab 10 as one who could give information, and she wondered if he should speak next, opining that this item was a key part of the transmittal.

Commr. Morris asked how many homes the applicant could build with the existing zoning.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that regarding the maximum land rights within the FLU, 208 acres were currently Rural Transition, which had the maximum of one unit per acre, and that the other 247 acres were already Urban Low, which was four units per acre. He commented that if a PUD zoning was overlaid on top of that, they could build 1,200 units, and that the applicant was proposing 1,600 units with some of it being active-adult. He stated that if they were just talking about straight zoning and limiting this property to an agricultural use and five-acre blueberry farms indefinitely, it reduced the number down to approximately 226 farm units with no urban environment.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that over half of the land was already Urban Low on the FLU map.

Mr. Fitzgerald clarified that 208 acres were currently Rural Transition, and that 247 acres were already Urban Low.

Commr. Campione mentioned that she traveled CR 452 much and was very familiar with the road conditions of this area; furthermore, there were many subdivisions that had gone into this area, and many people who enjoyed living in this area and would benefit from this development. She remarked that this was a substantial change being proposed, and that CR 452 had some issues; therefore, she opined that this developers agreement was critical to the overall equation.

Mr. Earhart pointed out that the developer would add the following: right and left turn lanes on CR 452, which he opined was a major offsite improvement; widen Apiary Road between CR 44 and CR 452 by going to 12-foot lanes and not multiple lanes; a traffic signal at Apiary Road and CR 44; and a roundabout or a traffic signal at South Fish Camp Road. He stated that these improvements totaled about $4.5 million, and that the developer was receiving credits for $3 million, noting that they were contributing about $1.5 million above the impact credits they would normally have to pay. He added that they had been in the process of adding shoulders to CR 452 with grant funding from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT).

Commr. Campione commented that during a recent Lake-Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) meeting, obtaining funding for CR 452 had been discussed for safety improvements, and she inquired when that funding would come and those improvements implemented.

Mr. Earhart answered that those shoulder improvements were programmed for the current fiscal year, and that the plan was to bid it in the first half of 2026 and to start construction by the last half of 2026. He clarified that this would not add lanes; however, it would add four-foot shoulders and other safety improvements at intersections.

Commr. Campione asked how residents would safely cross CR 452 into this new neighborhood for a restaurant or retail shop in the town center.

Mr. Earhart replied that there was going to be a trail that would go along the north side of the development that the developer would construct, and that there would be a sidewalk to interconnect the roundabouts to provide connection to both sides, noting that they would be working with the developer during development to provide safe access from the south to the north.

Commr. Campione asked about the possibility of sidewalks on South Fish Camp Road and Apiary Road, and noted that she had received requests for sidewalks from people who walked on those roads. She questioned if this was something that the County would explore doing through the Lake-Sumter MPO.

Mr. Earhart commented that it was not currently on the Lake-Sumter MPO list, and pointed out that it may be difficult to do, given the right of way situation and driveways on Apiary Road; however, he opined that they could explore that possibility.

Commr. Campione opined that it may be possible to do a modified version by extending the shoulder and creating a walking path as opposed to having a separate sidewalk, and she requested that if this item moved forward, the MPO would consider adding it to future improvements to promote safe walkability. She opined that since people in the existing Grand Island area wanted to walk safely, it should be on the list regardless, and that this project should precipitate it even more.

Commr. Smith asked for the location of the roundabout or traffic signal to be shown on the map, and inquired if the main entrance for the Lake Yale PUD was on CR 452, which would have a roundabout or traffic signal.

Mr. Earhart explained that there would probably be a roundabout at the intersection of CR 452 and Apiary Road for their entrance and another one at the intersection of South Fish Camp Road or wherever they ultimately placed their other entrance.

Commr. Smith estimated that this was about 3,000 feet or a half mile apart.

Mr. Earhart indicated that this was correct, and added that this would help slow down traffic and provide safety in the area.

Commr. Smith remarked that it was an either/or situation.

Mr. Earhart commented that it would be a roundabout if it fit or a traffic signal if they could not make the right of way work, noting that they would do an analysis to determine which one; however, their preference was for a roundabout.

Commr. Campione opined that one of the reasons that CR 452 was unsafe was that there were long straightaways, which she opined encouraged speeding, and that there were also some curves. She stated that she had seen many accidents on this road, that there was semi-truck traffic, and that there was no shoulder on the road. She opined that roundabouts could possibly dissuade

truck traffic from wanting to use CR 452, which would improve the safety of residents coming in to and out of their driveways from CR 452, and that calming traffic was a positive result of this development despite the added trips.

Commr. Smith pointed out that the agreement stated that if a roundabout was impractical, then there would be a traffic light, and he inquired what would make it practical and how would the Board obtain this information before giving approval.

Mr. Earhart answered that there would be a study to look at the traffic volumes, noting that if the traffic volume on the two streets was too heavy, then it would not work; however, he opined that this would not happen there. He related that it would be impractical if the right of way was not available, and noted that if the developer owned all the property around the intersection, then it would be practical. He mentioned that even though the developer only owned property on one side of the road, the location of the right of way could be moved up or down.

Commr. Smith commented that even though the developer owned much property on CR 452, he was not comfortable with the possibility of getting a traffic light.

Mr. Earhart remarked that the agreement could be adjusted as needed, and that they did not want to have to come before the Board if the roundabout was not at all practical.

Commr. Smith opined that this would be determined by the applicant, and that if they could not do a roundabout, then he was not interested.

Commr. Campione agreed, and opined that if there was a traffic signal on a road with high speeds, there could potentially be fatalities as a result. She opined that from a safety standpoint the traffic needed to be slowed down; additionally, even though this was a heavily traveled road at some times of the day, at other times it was not busy. She pointed out that instead of sitting at a traffic light, a roundabout allowed traffic to move, and opined that the more people that could be kept moving, the better, noting that they would be moving at slower speeds.

Commr. Parks opined that since a roundabout was what Mr. Earhart, as a professional engineer, recommended, the County needed to stop using the language “if practical” and make the roundabout a requirement, and he asked Mr. Earhart to show a list of everything that was proposed in the developers agreement to make it clear.

Mr. Earhart showed a page of the developers agreement, and explained that the asterisks at the bottom of the page described the locations of Entrance 1 and Entrance 2, noting that since this was preliminary, the locations could move.

Commr. Campione pointed out that this was on page 43 of the developers agreement.

Mr. Jonathan Huels, an attorney representing the applicant, stated that also in attendance on the current day was Mr. Bill Ray, the project planner for the applicant, Mr. Chuck Hiatt, with Halff Engineering and representing the applicant, Mr. Cliff Whitaker, the property owner, and several members of his family, noting that some members had been working on this project for most of this decade. He mentioned that he wanted to give more details about the improvements that were proposed in the developers agreement and to explain how the PUD met the requirements of the County’s Comp Plan for a TND, and noted that this was a large project that had gone through several public hearings. He clarified that it was not in the Emeralda Marsh Protection Area but

within the County's economic development overlay district, which had been codified in the Comp Plan, and that it had been created to attract targeted industries to the County, noting that even though this project was not proposing one of those targeted industries, he wanted to show that there was a policy decision to create growth in this area by its inclusion in that overlay district. He remarked that the majority of the project had the Urban Low FLU designation, and that the Comp Plan amendment was to unify the property that had been owned by the Whitakers for generations, to have a single FLU designation, and to allow it to be developed as a cohesive master planned PUD. He showed a map of the bifurcation of the FLU that had occurred after the Whitakers had owned this property for generations, and stated that under the Urban Low FLU designation for a project of this size, there was a mandate that a TND be implemented as part of a PUD. He explained that there were several guiding principles that decided what a TND looked like, including the following: a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented development; walkable street patterns; village-style roadway designs focusing on providing multimodal ways of getting around the community, such as golf carts, bicycles, trails along the streets, and multimodal corridors to provide pedestrian amenities; commercial areas that looked like main streets where the buildings were closer to the road frontage; parking areas for golf carts and bicycles; and public parks, green spaces, and village squares connected through a network of trails and sidewalks. He explained that the PUD master plan that was being proposed had eight phases with the three neighborhood districts, which were required by the Comp Plan, and that this would include about 1,600 single-family residences, with about 1,150 active adult residences and about 450 traditional family residences. He mentioned that there had been a conscious reduction in the amount of commercial entitlements from 100,000 square feet to 50,000 square feet, and noted that after reviewing the design, it was determined that 50,000 square feet of commercial space was more than sufficient to have the village-style retail and dining included in the main street and lakefront district. He commented that the Comp Plan required that there be three different neighborhoods, and he pointed out the neighborhood edge, which would be primarily single-family residential, noting that this would have a 25 vegetative buffer that would surround the entirety of the PUD. He stated that going inward to the neighborhood proper, there would be single-family residential neighborhoods interspaced between green spaces and interconnected with trails, sidewalks, and new roads, and that in the neighborhood core, there would be other housing types interconnected with walkable trails and sidewalks, such as townhomes. He relayed that in the main street core there would be neighborhood retail and dining, which was the confluence of the project, and that there would be mixed-use buildings with the potential for residences or offices on the second floor; furthermore, this area would cater to different modes of transportation, such as golf carts and bicycles. He remarked that the waterfront district was a sub-district of the main street core located in the northeast corner of the project near the Lake Yale waterfront and near some green space areas, and that this was an amenity where the community could come enjoy dining and retail opportunities. He mentioned that a large component of the TND were the streets, and that the standard was for roads throughout the community to have both 12-foot multimodal trails and five-foot sidewalks, noting that there would be multiple right of way widths throughout the

community. He relayed that an important component of TND was the green spaces, and that there would be over 100 acres of open spaces and parks throughout the project, including along Lake Yale next to the waterfront district. He elaborated that this was programmed to be an amenity for the community, and that even though lakefront homes were paramount, the Whitaker family wanted to preserve this space and have a central place for people to gather because it was a legacy project for them. He commented that all of the green spaces and open spaces would vary in sizes and widths, be interspersed throughout the community, and be connected by trails and sidewalks to promote walkability. He remarked that one of the different areas in the project was the Betty Whitaker Community Civic Center on Lake Yale, which was the former home of Ms. Betty Whitaker, and that this would be converted to a community civic center space where the public could gather and enjoy the view that Ms. Whitaker was very fond of. He mentioned that this project had to meet the requirements of the Comp Plan for a TND by having the three neighborhood areas, opining that it had been a long road to get to the current point through many discussions and rigorous staff reviews. He added that TND communities allowed for the efficient delivery of essential government services through a reduction in per resident infrastructure, maintenance, and services costs through economies of scale and economies of geographic scope, noting that economies of scale were exhibited when the County's cost of providing services to residents decreased as more residents were located within a smaller geographic area instead of being more spread out. He explained that economies of geographic scope were found when the cost of providing public facilities was reduced by the sheer number of people that were able to utilize them, and noted that this project would be serviced by central sewer and water. He relayed that some of the economic and infrastructure benefits included the following: having a master planned community with 450 acres being developed with a unified design and vision; having a phasing schedule that gave the certainty of what the project property would look like in the future; and having significant road infrastructure investment with offsite improvements. He commented that the existing public roads north of CR 452 adjacent to or within the project were substandard, and that they would be required by the County to improve them to current County standards, which would be a significant cost for the developer. He remarked that all internal new roads would be maintained through community financing practices, using a CDD or an MSBU, and that the offsite improvements would be implemented through a binding development agreement. He related that the total impact fees were estimated at $8.5 million to $9 million at the current day's rates, which would be paid as the project was developed, and that there would be a significant realization of ad valorem tax revenues from the County's taxation, noting that according to a projected tax revenue analysis prepared by Hubbard Construction Company, there would be a magnitude of realization to the County in tax revenues that would be generated from the project as proposed compared to what it was currently. He displayed a map that illustrated the offsite infrastructure investments that the owner and developer would be making in order to develop the property, and stated that many of these improvements were being done pursuant to the developers agreement. He pointed out that the central sewer utility line would be three miles in length, would be brought to the project through the CR 452 right of way, would be a significant cost of about $5 million, and would be

done prior to the first residents moving into the project. He mentioned that there was much infrastructure that would be installed at the developer's cost, and that there would be opportunities for oversizing and potential use for other projects in this area. He pointed out that the turn lane improvements would be done at the intersection of CR 452 and CR 44 to extend the existing turn lanes and improve function, and that this would be an infrastructure improvement that would be completed prior to phase one. He relayed that another improvement being completed prior to the first resident moving into the project was the widening and resurfacing of Apiary Road from CR 452 to CR 44, and that there would be sequential development improvements that would occur offsite afterwards, including the following: the traffic signal at CR 452 and CR 44, which would be prior to the second phase of the project; the roundabout at Apiary Road, which would be prior to the third phase of the project; and the roundabout or traffic signal at the intersection of South Fish Camp Road and CR 452, which would be prior to the fourth phase of the project. He commented that all of this infrastructure would be in place in the early phases of the project, and that much of it would be prior to the first person moving in. He opined that this was significant, and remarked that they had worked much with staff regarding this framework and timing. He displayed a table showing the improvements and the thresholds mentioned, and said that the need for substandard existing County roads to be brought up to current standards required offsite infrastructure investments of over $19 million. He stated that there had been letters of support and no objections from 15 of the owners of the surrounding parcels, and that those had been submitted to the record, opining that this was a testament to the Whitaker family for bringing forward a project with thoughtful design and infrastructure improvements that would benefit the community. He mentioned that regarding the roundabouts, they felt very strongly that a roundabout could be accommodated at the intersection of Apiary Road and CR 452 because it included two corners of the project; however, they did not know if it could be accommodated at the intersection of South Fish Camp Road and CR 452 because they owned only one corner of the project. He commented that if there was not sufficient right of way that could be obtained, then they wanted the option to install a traffic signal; however, he clarified that this was not their preference, as they wanted to have a roundabout in that intersection.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that they presented a TND, which had been discussed by the Whitakers for a long time as a vision for this area, and he asked what assurances there were to having architectural standards as opposed to cookie-cutter homes. He inquired what the plan was long-term, and wondered if there would be a national builder coming in.

Mr. Huels replied that there were more details to the plan, and that it would take much time to discuss all the performance requirements for each of the proposed neighborhoods established in the PUD, which had been reviewed by staff and were determined to be acceptable. He commented that there were architectural requirements that were imbedded for each of the neighborhoods, and that Mr. Ray could speak about that. He remarked that the details gave guarantees to the County that it would be built as proposed, as PUD zoning was unique and specific to the property, and that there were conditions and standards that made up the second and third sheets of the PUD plan that would be adopted. He mentioned that the Whitaker family had been

very conscious about how they wanted this property to look in the future, noting that since it had been in their family for generations, this was viewed as a legacy project. He stated that the Whitaker family made a conscious decision in the beginning to not bring in a developer that would guide what the development would look like, and that the Whitakers wanted to determine how it would look and then discuss it with homebuilders and make the selection of the proper fit with a master developer that had familiarity with these types of projects who they felt comfortable with, noting that it would be built over a number of phases. He related that the vision was that it would be a single master developer who would take what was written on paper and bring it to realization, and that they did not want to have another party make those decisions, noting that they did not want to settle for a developer that would drive for the most financial gain. He pointed out that this was not the way it was currently designed, opining that the offsite infrastructure improvements were unprecedented in the way they were being handled at the zoning phase of the project instead of the later phases where they would traditionally be dealt with. He commented that State law required the transportation concurrency to be met at the plat stage, and that in this case, they were much earlier in the stages; however, they worked with staff after hearing the Board's questions at the transmittal hearing and asked how this development was going to be dealing with transportation. He opined that this would benefit both parties, and that the way the Whitaker family had handled this made it evident that this was something that they wanted to be proud of at the end of the day.

Ms. Marsh clarified that Florida Statute 163.3202 did not allow the County to regulate building style or design elements for single-family homes or duplex buildings, and that the ordinance could only contain architectural design standards for commercial and multi-family residences; additionally, the County could not place anything in the ordinance addressing concerns about builders because they could not address architectural standards for single-family homes.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that this was State legislation from a couple of years prior where State legislators took away the right of local governments to include those standards.

Ms. Marsh commented that this was correct, noting that they had preempted the County.

Commr. Parks remarked that even though they were preempted from doing it, the Board could still ask about it, and opined that it was important because it was a concern for residents; additionally, he opined that the developer could voluntarily do it.

Ms. Marsh stated that even though it could be done voluntarily, the County could not include it in an ordinance that could be enforced.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the way the ordinance was worded could give the intention of the developer and say how it was represented, and opined that it was a moral imperative even though it was not a legally enforceable aspect. She commented that the Board was considering a project that had been represented by the developer as a legacy project, and opined that if the owners wanted that in the ordinance, understanding that the County could not enforce the architectural design from a legally binding standpoint unless State law changed, then

there could be provision for it. She opined that if State law went back to the way it used to be, making it a local decision, then the ordinance could reflect that.

Ms. Marsh stated that this could be done; however, she wanted people to understand that unless State law changed, the County would not be able to enforce those requirements.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that even though the County could not make a regulation requiring it, if the developer put it in the ordinance, then it could be enforced.

Ms. Marsh commented that the language in the Florida Statute allowed it to be in a PUD ordinance only until July 1, 2023.

Mr. Ray said that he recognized that building design was a concern of this project, and noted that since it was a TND development, it included buildings that made it look like a traditional neighborhood. He commented that the PUD approval included building design standards for a single-family residential unit, which included the following: craftsman; bungalow; Florida cracker; low country; southern living, which included the front porch; and historical architecture design standards, which required a variety of architectural features and materials, such as stone, stucco, craftsman columns, porches, metal roofs, tiles, shutters, etc. to achieve the architectural style.

Ms. Marsh pointed out that this was only for commercial and multi-family buildings and not for single-family.

Mr. Ray mentioned that it was in the PUD as a residential design standard in the notes on the second page, and that they also had commercial design standards. He stated that they would put it on the record that this was the intention along with the following: exterior front-loaded, rear-loaded, or side-loaded garages may be utilized; single-family residential platted units built with the minimum of a one-car garage with a two car driveway; conversion of garages being converted into living space would be prohibited; external colors shall be earth tones, which was similar language used in other PUD; all amenities, such as sidewalks, golf cart paths, pocket parks, and open space shall be maintained by the homeowners association (HOA); a section included for bear management, noting that bears were an issue in the State of Florida moving forward; dark sky lighting with exterior lighting blending in with the architectural style of the development; and defined commercial design standards, which came from an accumulation of drawings, language, and design guidelines from various community redevelopment areas (CRAs), such as the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento CRA, and the City of the Eustis, noting that since the development was close to them, they were required to coordinate with them as a jurisdiction. He commented that one of the key elements of this project was the lakefront area on Lake Yale, and that since they fully recognized and supported the County agreement to improve the water quality of Lake Yale, they would have a small, centrally located access to the lake, which would be permitted through the State, Lake County staff, and the United States (U.S.) Army Corps of Engineers, as it was a Federal waterbody. He remarked that the stormwater management would require low impact development stormwater treatment mechanisms, which used natural vegetation to sequester nutrients prior to discharge, and that they were prohibiting the use of septic tanks, which was one of the leading contributors to groundwater degradation and surface water adverse impacts in the state. He related

that they supported using the roundabout alternative at CR 452 and Apiary Road; however, at South Fish Camp Road, they only controlled one quarter of an intersection. He stated that if the County could acquire right of way on the other quarter of the north half, then, they could construct the same type of roundabout in a public/private partnership, opining that it was the best alternative design. He commented that since they did not have the power to acquire right of way for a project, they put in an either/or option, and that if the right of way could not be acquired, then they could construct a traffic signal.

Commr. Campione mentioned that there was a provision in the ordinance that said that any grading would comply with the LDR and Comp Plan, and expressed concern that subdivision approvals were used as a way to mine property for sand under the auspices of residential development. She questioned what assurance the County had that this would not occur at this location.

Mr. Ray answered that the intent was to balance the site, and that he did not know how to prevent the export of additional fill. He mentioned that they were open to suggestions, noting that it was not their intention to drop the elevation of one of the prime visions in Lake County.

Commr. Campione opined that it was the view that made the property special, and indicated her understanding that there was a limitation on how much dirt could be removed, which was tied to stormwater ponds, prohibiting them from exceeding what they needed to take off for stormwater ponds.

Mr. Ray stated that they envisioned complying with existing regulations, and that if something required that they export more material than what those regulations required, then they would have to come back before the Board.

Mr. Earhart clarified that they were allowed to export 200 percent of what the pond volume was without obtaining a mining permit, which was a very small amount.

Commr. Campione inquired why it was 200 percent instead of 100 percent.

Mr. Earhart answered that it would allow them to balance the site; however, it was minimal when considering what was required for the ponds, noting that they could not dig the ponds 220 feet deep.

Commr. Campione questioned if there were stormwater ponds onsite currently, and relayed her understanding that the requirement for stormwater ponds came with the residential use.

Mr. Earhart replied that there were no existing stormwater ponds, and that they would be required before runoff went into the lake. He elaborated that they would have to get a permit from the County and from the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD), and noted that the SJRWMD had recently changed their rules, making them more stringent than they used to be.

Commr. Campione mentioned that runoff currently went straight into the lake, and that a residential subdivision provided more stormwater treatment.

Mr. Earhart opined that it should either maintain or improve the water quality of the lake.

Mr. Ray remarked that the SJRWMD had recently upgraded their regulations to address nutrient loading criteria, which they would have to meet, and that there was currently not a monitored procedure because it was an agriculture use, which had largely been carte blanche. He

explained that the nutrient removal criteria for phosphorus and nitrogen would have to be demonstrated and be permitted in accordance to Lake County and State regulations, and that the stormwater ponds would give additional nutrient sequestration.

Commr. Morris related that he had received emails expressing concern about the traffic study, claiming that it was an old traffic study which did not take into consideration other developments that had been approved in the area, and he asked if Mr. Ray could expand on that.

Mr. Ray commented that when they originally came before the Board, they were given direction to revisit the traffic analysis to ensure that everything was corrected. He stated that they submitted methodology to Lake County and completed a traffic report, and that when Lake County reviewed that, they realized that they wanted to revise the methodology and add additional intersections to be improved. He related that working together with staff, they collected new current data on the additional intersections, and noted that they had the most current data to realistically address the issues. He mentioned that this was why it had taken nearly a year to come back to the Board.

Commr. Morris asked if they had taken into consideration the other developments in the area.

Mr. Ray indicated that they had, and said that this was part of the approved methodology.

Commr. Campione related that the County had received many emails, and that she had not answered those emails because of the quasi-judicial nature of this case; however, she wanted to address a few items. She remarked that in the past, the Board had been outspoken about rural land uses that had been changed to urban land uses after being annexed into cities and changed to higher densities; however, the BCC was not discussing a rural land use, as half of this property was already urban. She mentioned that those land uses went back to 1985 when the State of Florida adopted its growth management law, and that this was the first of many rules and regulations that came down from the State to try to make land use decisions uniform across the State of Florida to address growth management. She commented that in the late 1980's, the County had multiple hearings and workshops, and that it put into place its first Comp Plan and FLU map. She related that the Whitaker family, who had been farming this property with citrus for a couple of generations, had participated in those hearings and had worked hard to procure a land use designation that reflected what they thought was appropriate with the big picture. She mentioned that the window of planning was 30 years, and that the County was doing this whole process again in 2026 for the next 30 years. She remarked that this property had land designations of Urban Low and Rural Transition, which was suburban at the time it was created, and that the owner was seeking to combine them and do a master plan, noting that most of the developments in that general area were piecemeal projects. She opined that there was much anti-growth sentiment currently, and that people were upset that the roads were more congested than they had ever been because more people were traveling through Lake County, more people were commuting, and there was more development. She mentioned that even though much of that development was in the cities, some of it was in the county, and that the County considered the following: what the map said currently; what land uses needed to be honored; and what the property owner's expectations were

for all the years they had invested. She opined that the County tried to be reasonable and fair, and that the basic constitutional rights people had as Americans to have private property were critical. She explained that when land was mapped out in the FLU planning process, it presented expectations that could be enforced, and noted that the County did not want to place the landowner in a position where they had to hire a lawyer to ensure the rights that they already had. She relayed that the Board had to consider this from a legal standpoint, an expectations standpoint, and a fairness standpoint, and that the County had to factor in issues, such as the schools handling the growth, which was done through the mechanism of concurrency and proportionate share mitigation, noting that if the schools were overcapacity for the number of units the developer had, then they had to give the school district funding to build additional space. She commented that transportation concurrency was taking place on the current day, as the developer would have to pay for their share of impacts, and that in this case, there was a developers agreement beyond what the calculations showed was owed. She mentioned that the Board was not evaluating this decision in a vacuum, and that the history had to be considered as well as the growth management plan, the FLU map, the LDR, and the Comp Plan.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Anthony Randall, a resident of Lake County, stated that he was a fourth-generation beekeeper, and opined that turning this agricultural land into a project would displace beekeepers who pollinated the blueberries and the orange trees. He opined that even though the bees could pull nectar from plants growing around the marshlands, wetlands, and lakes, which were the only places that provided nectar at this time of the year, the beekeepers in this area would lose much profit. He indicated concern about traffic on South Fish Camp Road, and said that he did not like it when generational farmers sold off their land for houses. He opined that since it was already zoned for one unit per five acres, it should be used for rural housing, and that there could be beautiful multimillion dollar homes on five acres there overlooking the lake with no one complaining. He opined that the County would be disturbing neighborhoods that were already there by widening the roads and putting in roundabouts and traffic signals, and that people currently walked there every day with hardly any traffic; furthermore, he expressed concerns about the roundabouts slowing and backing up traffic.

Ms. Dawn Luciano, a resident of Lake County, relayed her understanding that water and sewer would be coming in, and asked if that meant that the City of Eustis was going to annex this property. She indicated concerns about roundabouts, and opined that they did not work. She stated that she was curious about the last traffic study, and expressed concerns about traffic on CR 452, opining that it would affect the Wedgewood neighborhood. She opined that the Board had a fiduciary duty to the people, and that they felt as if they were not heard.

Ms. Brenda Kane, a resident of CR 452, commented that she opposed this development, and indicated concerns about the traffic and the roundabouts, opining that there would be much congestion. She opined that this issue needed to be analyzed again, and that the people who were commenting should be listened to.

Ms. Louise Chen, a resident of Treasure Island Road, showed some pictures of birds to reflect the motto of "Real Florida, Real Close" and a map of the Lake Yale area, and pointed out that this project was only a half of a mile away from the Emeralda Marsh Conservation Area. She opined that this property could not be annexed because the City of Eustis had a JPA with the County, and that this development was more of a small city that was separated from everything else. She expressed concern that all of the Rural Transition areas would turn into Urban Low density, and wondered what would be left of the rural areas.

Mr. Alan Chen, a resident of Treasure Island Road, commented that the traffic study that was provided showed that all the roads associated with this project were rated at a D level of service, and that this project would add 10,000 trips from 1,600 high-density residences. He indicated concerns about traffic, and opined that all of the additional growth was not accounted for. He displayed an elevation map, and expressed concern about runoff, opining that the lake would degrade. He opined that this area should maintain one house per five acres even though the current zoning allowed more, and that the rural transition region should be maintained. He also opined that the improvements to the roads would not be sufficient, and that the County should have an infrastructure first/development second approach.

Ms. Kendrick expressed concerns about development, opining that this was just the beginning. She hoped that the Board would examine this thoroughly before making a decision, and opined that there were many issues in the report, such as the roundabouts versus the traffic signals. She indicated concerns about the environment, the stormwater, and the animals, such as gopher tortoises.

Mr. Greg Nacke, a resident of Lake County, mentioned that he supported this development, and opined that it was a great plan, as it was an actual master plan that would be great for the area.

Ms. Linda O'Donnell, a resident of South Fish Camp Road, commented that she was a homeowner in full support of this plan. She relayed that for the past 31 years, she had been a community association consultant and manager in the Cities of Palm Beach, Naples, Weston, and the Fisher Island area and had seen hundreds of these types of plans, opining that the Whitakers had done a great job with this project.

Ms. C.J. Blancett, a resident of Lake County, stated that it took it took her family 33 years to purchase their place in rural Lake County, and opined that even though property owners should be allowed to build on their own property, they should not be allowed to change the makeup of an entire area. She opined that Florida Sunshine Law prohibited the Commissioners from meeting with the developer outside of a noticed public meeting to discuss matters that would come before the Board, and that recusal was required. She said that she was a State Director for the Constitution Party of Florida and Chairman of the Lake County Chapter, and opined that any County Commissioners who had accepted donations from the developer or their immediate family while deliberating on the developer's interest had created a conflict and should recuse themselves. She opined that the continued participation in a decision that favored the outcome of a developer that had financially or politically supported a Commissioner undermined the integrity of the BCC and called into question the legitimacy of its actions, and that any Commissioner not residing in the

district they represented violated a technical requirement and the foundation of representation in government.

Ms. Newton relayed her understanding that if the right of way on Apiary Road was insufficient, then the developer would just resurface the road instead of widening it, and that the traffic signal at the intersection of Apiary Road and CR 44 would only happen if conditions were met. She opined that the public was not assured of what would be improved, and that the extension of the turn lanes, such as those done at CR 44B, would not be sufficient for an extra 5,000 to 9,000 cars. She expressed concerns about the water situation as it was written, and she wondered if the development was going to be providing utilities to the PUD themselves if the City of Eustis could not.

Mr. David Williamson, a candidate for Lake County Commissioner for Commission District 4, remarked that even though one of the property owners and a project engineer of this proposal was a friend, he was opposed to this development. He opined that elected officials were obligated to make decisions based on the best interest of the public, and that anything less undermined public trust. He relayed his understanding that the proposal included about 1,600 homes, which was more than the 1,275 that would already be allowed, and that this would equate to less than a quarter acre per home, opining that this level of density was incompatible with the surrounding area. He opined that public opposition was clear, and that the impacts of this development were significant, including the following: roadway congestion; school overcrowding; lack of local employment; strained utilities; and unacceptable first responder times. He opined that approving a project of this magnitude without addressing those issues would place a large burden on the residents and emergency services, and noted that the Board had repeatedly voiced opposition of high-density developments. He opined that even though growth could not be stopped and property rights must be respected, not every proposal should be approved as presented, and that the Board had the authority and the duty to act conservatively and responsively. He indicated concerns about overdevelopment and flooding, and opined that ignoring those lessons would be negligent. He opined that the public wanted responsible planning that protected infrastructure, public safety, and their way of life, and that the current proposal was unacceptable and should be revised to reduce density and impact. He expressed concerns about violating Florida Sunshine Laws and about donations to Commissioner campaigns, opining that transparency and accountability mattered.

Mr. Jochim pointed out that the traffic study and other study consultants were chosen by the developer, which he opined was wrong, and he opined that the Counties and Cities should be hiring objective planners and consultants and reviewing their work to ensure that it was objective. He opined that even though the property owner had property rights to develop and build a large development, they should not ignore the roads, and he expressed concerns about traffic and vegetation on roundabouts.

Mr. Jimmy Crawford, a resident of the City of Tavares, mentioned that even though he had been a land use lawyer since 1994, he did not represent anybody in this deal, and opined that the comments at the current BCC meeting were indicative of a high growth county and a product of

what the State had done. He opined that however the BCC voted, residents should talk to their legislative representatives, and said that in the previous 10 years, the State had done the following: taken over traffic and school concurrency, noting that the County could not deny a project based on those if the developer was paying their pro rata share, which this applicant had done and more; required the County to have a Comp Plan that planned for 30 years-worth of growth at the numbers given by the State; required the County to accommodate the expected growth; taken away architectural regulation; the stormwater rules were largely governed by the State and the water management districts; and SB 180 took away the County's ability to adopt any more restrictive land use or zoning regulations. He opined that the government closest to the people was the best government, as anybody could call and meet with a County Commissioner if they had a genuine issue; however, there were many conservative lawmakers in the City of Tallahassee who wanted to take more control from the Counties. He opined that the current BCC was not pro-growth, and noted that he routinely had projects denied, which required him to redo them, as the current developer had been doing for years.

Mr. Michael Hill, a resident of the City of Eustis, stated that he was a fourth-generation farmer, and that he had previously worked with the Whitakers. He opined that it was not easy to stay in farming because it was not profitable, and that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) had hurt Florida agriculture because they had to compete with a higher labor cost, which depleted profits in a free-trade environment. He commented that Florida citrus farms had produced 240 million boxes of citrus per year 15 years prior, and that there were 12 million boxes produced per year currently. He opined that even though the Whitakers had oranges ready to pick, it was not worth the cost of picking, and that the U.S. imported so much that the American farmer could not make a living.

Mr. Brandon Hartzog, a resident of Lake County, indicated his understanding that Commissioner Campione had received donations from the Whitaker family.

Mr. Justin Sayer, a resident living adjacent to the current project, related that he worked in the industry of construction, and opined that nobody cared for growth, as it was an inconvenience. He opined that if the owner of the property broke up the property and sold 50 acres at a time, it would be easier to develop, and that the current landowner was doing everything in his power to try and better the project. He opined that even though people did not like roundabouts, the roundabout at the intersection of CR 561 and CR 455 had prevented many incidents because it slowed cars coming down from the hill too fast. He opined that everybody was entitled to let their land go if it was not profitable, and that it was not good to be land rich with no funds to pay bills. He believed that this project was trying to change that aspect, and opined that by making the roads wider throughout the project, giving them a retail section in that area, and creating a city inside itself, they were constructing a dream and a future that all of these communities should do. He opined that infrastructure had to come first; however, he opined that it was not fair that the Whitakers should have the responsibility of constructing additional infrastructure because they wanted to get rid of this property, and that it was not even known if the intersection of CR 44 and CR 452 at the Lake County Fairgrounds would have issues for years. He commented that the

reports helped the County know how to make the infrastructure better, and opined that even though the reports were not always right, everybody tried to the get the best information available. He opined that at the end of it, this project would be beneficial to that side of town even though it would inconvenience him.

There being no one else who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

RECESS AND REASSEMBLY

The Chairman called a recess at 11:40 a.m. for 10 minutes.

LAKE YALE PUD CONTINUED

Commr. Campione asked if the applicant would like to do a rebuttal or to address issues brought up by the public.

Mr. Huels commented that the County had a set process regarding transportation methodology, and that the developer did not get to come up with a methodology, put together a report, and send it to the County to be reviewed by staff. He explained that the methodology came from the County's transportation planners and engineers and was given to the developer's team who then went forward to carry out the work based on that methodology, which included traffic counts, background data, the most current data available, and the projected growth rates of the county looking forward to determine what the transportation modeling was going to look like in the future, and that once it was complete, it was brought back to the County and reviewed by the County's transportation engineers who would either accept it or require modifications. He stated that this process had caused some delays to accomplish all of that work before it was finally deemed complete, opining that it was a rigorous process driven by County staff. He mentioned that the roundabout design had not been determined yet, and that they were currently at the Comp Plan and rezoning phase, noting that even though they had identified where the infrastructure improvements were going to be made, it would be a County-owned structure determined by County staff. He believed that roundabouts were the best ways to handle the two intersections on CR 452, as they served as transportation calming mechanisms, and opined that they would be e ffective in bringing speeds down. He remarked that the 45-page developers agreement was driving towards having infrastructure first and development second, and opined that it was innovative and unprecedented for the County to have infrastructure improvements at this stage of review. He pointed out that much would occur before the first home was even built in the project, and that all would be completed in the early phases of the development, noting that this was a unique model that departed from what would otherwise be required by County code or State laws. He related that the property itself had been in active agriculture production for a long time, and opined that even though the Whitakers would like to farm this land forever, they were also realistic about what the future could bring, they did not have a next generation to hand the farm off to, and it may not be economically feasible to continue to operate there. He mentioned that the Whitakers had taken much time and effort to evaluate this project, and that since this property had been in their family for generations, they viewed the project as a legacy for them, opining that this was evident in the

comments of the adjacent neighbors showing support for it, who would be affected the most by this project.

Commr. Campione commented that one of things she prided herself on was being objective, and that since her family had been in that area for a long time, she knew this area and the how bad the road was. She said that if she was going to make a decision based on her emotions, she would not vote for this project, and that she would want this area to stay the way it was, to keep the land in farming, and to keep it from changing. She pointed out that she had family living there and sentimental attachment; however, her responsibility as an elected official and as a County Commissioner was to uphold the laws and regulations that the BCC was required to follow. She opined that this was why she had to be objective and follow the rule of law, and that even though people were concerned about development, this did not give them the right to ignore the rules and the Constitution. She opined that this society was not governed by whatever the most popular post was, and that she was going to do what was right, be objective, follow the rule of law, adhere to the Constitution, make fair decisions, and review the facts of every single case. She opined that not every project should be approved because of the belief of property rights; however, property owners should not be denied projects just because one thought that Lake County needed a moratorium, which was illegal. She opined that it was important to have elected officials who were willing to stand up for what was right even when it was not popular, and noted that the County had spent much time reviewing this adding many extra requirements that she had never seen done on a project before, such as requiring infrastructure to be done in advance. She opined that it would be great if every project was reviewed from the standpoint of infrastructure in advance, and that this was a trend that could possibly be started by this development review. She indicated concern about the intersection of CR 42 and CR 452, opining that it was dangerous, especially if one was trying to make a lefthand turn onto CR 42. She mentioned that she had spoken to the Public Works Department, and related that the County was in conversations with Marion County and FDOT, as this intersection was outside of Lake County's jurisdiction. She stated that even though the County could not require improvements at this intersection, they could ask and advocate for them, noting that this was what they were doing. She remarked that the Lake County Fairgrounds were in a state of transition because it was being relocated to the City of Tavares, and opined that there could be opportunities to shift the intersection of CR 452 and CR 44 and possibly utilize some of that County-owned property to create a better intersection there. She opined that adding turn lanes would help; however, she opined that it would not fix the intersection, as it needed to be redone, and she asked the Board to consider that in the future as something that could be done in relation to the County vacating the Lake County Fairgrounds. She commented that there would be some shoulder improvement on CR 452 as a result of work that was going to happen over the following three to six months in that area, and opined that even though much of it was zoned Urban Low and Rural Transition, it would be nice if the rest of that Rural Transition area would stay intact as a buffer to the Rural area. She opined that the master plan was better than piecemeal development and a hodgepodge of housing, and pointed out that those developments could receive administrative approvals because they would be below the threshold for PUDs. She opined that

the County was trading some additional units in return for a project that was a better plan that included dedicated property that would be used for a community center using the Whitaker house that was on the lake, as well as some retail and restaurant areas that could be utilized by people in the Grand Island area without having to drive through town. She opined that even though it was not perfect, Lake County could not get anywhere if it had to be perfect, as this was an impossible measure, and that the attributes of the infrastructure being done in phases and in advance was critical. She opined that the roundabout at the intersection of CR 455 and CR 561 had saved lives, and that even though the County received much criticism when it was approved years prior, it had proved that roundabouts worked, as it slowed traffic and prevented accidents. She expressed appreciation to Mr. and Ms. Chen, for their comments and their critique of projects; however, she opined that their opposition had become very one-sided, with the developer at the other extreme. She opined that the legislators had been responding to those extremes over the prior couple of years, and that since all of the pressure went to the local government officials to turn projects down, the legislature had stepped in and forced the County to approve applications that would not otherwise be approved. She elaborated that SB 180 took away the County's right to make more stringent regulations, and pointed out that the County could not address issues after Hurricane Milton to improve the stormwater management; additionally, the Live Local Act forced local government to approve affordable housing projects without the local government having any input. She opined that if people could work together, look at these cases on a factual basis for their merits, and address important issues, such as transportation, then local governments would work correctly; additionally, she opined that if all these improvements were done as presented in the development plan, then it could be good for the transportation side.

Commr. Parks indicated appreciation to the public for their participation and input, and to Commissioner Campione for her comments about process and for the experience and research that she had done. He remarked that the same questions about development were discussed 20 to 30 years prior, and opined that about 90 percent of the applications always involved large homebuilders from other areas paying much funding for attorneys to present a plan for the County; however, he pointed out that the Whitakers had started this on their own. He relayed his understanding that they did not have a major homebuilder leading the process contingent upon obtaining entitlements, that they had a vision for the property, that they wanted something better for the next generation, and that they paid much funding on their own to do this, opining that this case was different. He commented that the Wellness Way area and the Wolf Branch Innovation District were County led rather than developer led, and that this case was being led by the family to get something that was not contingent upon what the publicly-traded developers wanted. He mentioned that this development avoided a hodgepodge of developments, as had been done in south Lake County, which he opined could have been done in this instance, and opined that the family selling off 50 acres at a time would have resulted in nothing but houses. He stated that he respected the process and the applicant in this case taking much effort, opining that it was not perfect. He opined that it was not a constitutional property right to allow just anything to occur, and that the Board could deny a project for good reasons; however, there was a due process. He

opined that if there was something better, even if it was not the best, then the Board could be objective and consider it. He then expressed concern about the buffers, and asked for the buffers to be changed to 100 percent Florida Native plants if this moved forward.

Commr. Smith remarked that he had issues with someone being told they could not do anything with their own property, and opined that the property owner had a right to do what he wanted with the property; however, there were rules and regulations. He indicated concern about the uncertainty with the roundabouts, and said that if the roundabouts could not be guaranteed, then he was not in favor of it. He stated that he did not like 40-foot lot lines, and opined that they should be a minimum of 65 feet or 6,500 square feet total lots. He expressed concern about this being an age-restricted community and about taking away the Rural Transition area to Urban Low. He opined that there should be a transition area from Urban Low to Rural; otherwise, it made rural property contiguous and subject to change.

Commr. Morris said that he would like to find something in between the 1,200 homes that could be built currently and the 1,600 homes that were planned in the PUD, and he indicated concern about the way the County did impact fee credits, noting that the applicant's investment would be $1.5 million. He commented that he would like to see the road system completed before the first house was sold, as that this would show accountability on both sides, and said that he did not want another lawsuit.

Commr. Campione mentioned that there was a difference between Sunshine Law and quasi-judicial discussion, and that Sunshine Law was for when more than one Commissioner discussed items outside of a public meeting. She clarified that quasi-judicial discussions were when a Commissioner spoke directly to someone with an application, which was allowed by law, and opined that a Commissioner was not doing a good job if they did not gather all the information, noting that this was not a Sunshine Law violation.

Commr. Morris inquired if the developer could address the concerns about the landscaping and infrastructure.

Commr. Smith suggested that the developer could answer questions from the Board before moving forward with a vote for approval.

Commr. Campione commented that she had seen roundabouts that had been shifted onto the landowner's property.

Mr. Huels related that they felt good about mandating the roundabout at the intersection of Apiary Road and CR 452; however, he indicated concern about having adequate right of way for the roundabout at the intersection of South Fish Camp Road and CR 452 because they only controlled the northwest corner of that intersection, opining that it was insufficient to accommodate a transition. He opined that if the Board wanted to mandate it to approve the project, then they could live with that, as it was their intent to have a roundabout there rather than a traffic signal. He commented that if the Board wanted to modify the developers agreement to make that a requirement, then they would be willing to do that and take it as far as possible, opining that if they could not achieve that, then they may possibly have to come back before the Board. He pointed out that the whole transportation methodology was based on 1,600 homes, a portion of

which were age restricted, and that to change the unit count would likely change the transportation generation and what infrastructure improvements would result from less homes and less traffic. He stated that after working with staff, they felt good about what was being presented, opining that it was innovative and unprecedented, as they had frontloaded those infrastructure improvements to occur in the very early phases. He elaborated that the County's traditional transportation concurrency process was more of a pay-as-you-go method , and that as the project was built out, each phase would go through it as that phase was coming forward for a plat or multiple plats, which would cause the infrastructure improvements to happen over a much longer period of time or be met with a proportionate share funding arrangement that would go to the County's budget without any real improvements being made by the developer. He opined that they had been very innovative, and that they had been conscious of what phase staff wanted to see each of those improvements. He said that they wanted to work this out on the current day since they had spent much time on this, and pointed out that they had a deadline to meet for the State's requirement to have the adoption hearing for the Comp Plan. He stated that they could agree to commit to have the roundabouts mandated as part of the development agreement on both Apiary Road and South Fish Camp Road; however, a reduction in the size of the project would be more difficult for them because it could change the analysis, noting that they did not want to have to start over there as they had already spent much time to get this before the Board.

Commr. Campione remarked that the age restriction on the neighborhood lowered the trip generation and made less impact on the schools, and opined that it helped with the price point, as it was geared to somebody who was able to afford a more expensive home.

Mr. Huels opined that someone could start with a larger home at the edge of the neighborhood, and that as they transitioned and still wanted to live in the community, they could move to the interior of the community and live in more of a villa or smaller home, requiring less maintenance while still having all the amenities.

Commr. Campione questioned if the ordinance could mention the option so that it was not mandated by the ordinance, and opined that it would depend on what was imposed on themselves, which would dictate trip generation.

Ms. Marsh mentioned that there would have to be contingencies regarding the transportation agreement because if there was just regular housing, there would be a higher trip generation, and they would be required to do more improvements, which were not being addressed in the agreement.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that if a large developer came in and wanted to do something different, then it would have to go before the Board and be changed.

Ms. Marsh stated that it would be appropriate to bring it back for the Board to reevaluate it and the transportation component. She recommended that the Board vote on the Comp Plan amendment first, which would change about 200 acres from Rural Transition to Urban Low, noting that if that was not approved, then the rest was not a point of discussion.

Commr. Parks inquired if this would include all the conditions, traffic concerns, and lowering the number of units, or if those were for the zoning case.

Ms. Marsh indicated that these were zoning issues.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that Commissioner Smith was not in favor of changing Rural Transition to Urban Low, and she questioned if it would be more favorable if there were 65-foot lots, no age restrictions, and mandated roundabouts.

Commr. Smith commented that he had stated his concerns and had given the applicant the opportunity to take action on them; however, since the applicant was not taking action, he was not in favor of this item.

Mr. Huels suggested that this case be tabled to the next available hearing so they could consider the feedback they had received.

Ms. Marsh related that the next available hearing date would be February 3, 2026.

Commr. Campione opined that in light of all the time and funding that had been put into this, they had a reasonable request, and that since they now knew what the concerns were, they would have to work it out.

Commr. Smith agreed, and opined that the Board could give them time to go over some of the concerns.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board postponed all items related to the Lake Yale PUD until February 3, 2026.

O'BRIEN ROAD PUD

Mr. Fitzgerald presented Tab 4, Rezoning Case # PZ2024-218, O'Brien Road PUD. He explained that this was a transmittal hearing for an FLU amendment, and that the requested action was to amend the FLU map to change the FLU category on approximately 68.3 acres from Rural to PUD to facilitate the development program for a 41-unit single family residential subdivision. He recalled that the Planning and Zoning Board recommended approval of this item by a vote of 5-1, and said that the location was south of West Libby Road and east of South O'Brien Road in the City of Groveland area. He remarked that the project was proposed at 0.6 dwelling units per acre, and that if the large-scale amendment was approved by the BCC for transmittal, the companion rezoning request for the subject property from Agriculture to PUD would be presented to the Board for approval at the same time at a forthcoming meeting. He stated that on July 31, 2025, the applicant's development team hosted a community meeting to inform the public of their plans for this FLU amendment and rezoning, and that the subject property was located within the City of Groveland's interlocal service boundary agreement (ISBA). He mentioned that the City provided comments that they were concerned about capacity for water and wastewater, noting that they were against this amendment from an FLU standpoint. He elaborated that the City opined that an increase in density in the area was not warranted, and that they were concerned for environmental impacts and inadequate transportation infrastructure. He remarked that transportation had been reviewed by County staff, and that the development was not anticipated to have a negative effect on level of service for traffic, noting that the traffic impact analysis would be further reviewed as part of the preliminary plat review process. He said that neighboring parcels were developed at a similar density with some at a higher density, and that the City of Groveland would not provide water and sewer to the subject property; rather, well and septic was proposed.

He commented that any environmental concerns would be addressed, if approved, at the time of site plan approval, which included the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) provisions for protected species.

Mr. Crawford, representing the applicant, clarified that this item was only for transmittal of the land use plan amendment and was not a binding approval. He said that the staff report indicated that they were consistent with the Comp Plan and the LDR, and that they applied for a PUD land use to ensure that they were limited to their request of 0.6 units per acre. He relayed that the Comp Plan encouraged a variety of housing types, and that 41 lots on 68 net acres would give everyone a full one acre lot and 25 percent open space in addition to the stormwater. He pointed out that there was one net unit per acre to the north, four units per acre to the south and east, and predominately one unit per five acres to the west. He commented that for adjacent and surrounding subdivisions, the City of Groveland had approved or annexed 1,112 lots, 50 feet by 100 feet, and that the average built density was 2.4 units per acre which was four times the requested density. He clarified that the applicant did not want septic tanks, and that they would do a central Onsyte system if the City of Groveland would not serve them. He opined that the City had softened its opposition to this, and relayed that they had told him that they did not want the County approving any densities in their ISBA until they reached the updated agreement; however, he opined that this was not practical.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Robert Sieffert, a neighbor of the subject property, recalled that he had expressed support for the park at the northeast corner being an animal preserve instead, and that Mr. Crawford did not seem to have any issues with this. He expressed concerns for the septic service, and he questioned if it would be standalone. He said that the applicant wanted to cross O'Brien Road from Coralwood Lane, and that it was a clay road district. He opined that putting a piece of asphalt across a road would be a dam, and he questioned if it would be washed over with clay. He suggested to pave all the way up to the West Libby Road area, opining that this was the only way that they could keep that road from falling back across the other road. He said that he did not have any issues with one house on an acre of property, opining that it blended in with the neighborhood. He opined that there was an issue with cut throughs in their subdivisions for going to Florida's Turnpike, and that these 41 acres would present more of an issue with this. He opined that the County's maintenance crews could not keep up with the clay roads there, noting that they were affected each time there was a downpour. He also indicated support for increasing the 15 foot buffer to 30 feet.

Mr. Demetri Sookraj, Broker and Owner of Fortune Realty of Clermont, said that he lived on Coralwood Lane. He opined that putting 41 homes on this property would affect the area negatively because all of those cars would ingress and egress through Coralwood Lane; furthermore, South O'Brien Road was not paved. He opined that the road was devastated each time there was rain, and that they would see 80 to 100 cars going down Coralwood Lane if this PUD was approved. He opined that South O'Brien Road needed to be the main point of entry for

these cars, and that this property should stay at one unit per five acres. He hoped that the Board would not support this.

There being no one else who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Crawford agreed with what Mr. Sieffert had said, noting that they would make the park in the northeast corner passive only. He clarified that Coralwood Lane was paved, which was why the County wanted their exit to go out at this road; furthermore, they would have to accommodate the drainage and stormwater issues of crossing South O'Brien Road at the permitting phase with the SJRWMD and the County. He commented that the Onsyte system was a certified utility system that had to be monitored quarterly by a professional, and that the homeowners would pay into this on their tax bill. He hoped to find City of Groveland utilities, and stated that one acre lots helped them regarding gopher tortoises as they would have to relocate anywhere there was disturbance; furthermore, they would not have to do mass grading.

Commr. Campione asked what the City of Groveland had indicated that they would be agreeable to.

Mr. Crawford replied that the City would like to stay at one unit per five acres until adoption of the new joint planning agreement (JPA), and that they had cited that there was a 50 percent open space requirement for their overall area for this. He said that the applicant provided 25 percent open space and one acre lots, and opined that many people did not want to live on a 45 or 50 foot lot with a small backyard and community amenities. He added that the applicant was trying to provide this alternative.

Commr. Campione inquired if the City was saying that once the agreement was in place, they would put a designation on it that would allow the same number of lots with 50 percent open space.

Mr. Crawford denied this, noting that they had not given a formal answer. He relayed that the City originally said no on the utilities, and that later the City's Utilities Director said that they could perhaps serve them.

Ms. Marsh recalled that the JPA with the City had been approved in May 2025, and that it was currently valid until May 2026 pending approval of a transportation agreement. She commented that if the Board chose to transmit this item, staff could receive clarification from the City before it came back for final adoption.

Mr. Crawford showed the City's last comment from November 12, 2025, noting that the only comment was from the City's Transportation and Public Works Director. He elaborated that the comment indicated that the City had capacity concerns with water and wastewater, and that the City should consider formally opposing this with consideration of a resolution by the City Council. He said that the applicant was still talking to the City.

Commr. Parks asked if the City had spoken at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting, and Mr. Crawford denied this. Commissioner Parks then relayed his understanding in talking with the City elected officials that they had concerns about this similar to what Mr. Sookraj had mentioned, including the clay road district and open space. He mentioned that many of the items

on the list were done before the City's large plan, and he relayed his understanding that the City's concern included increased traffic on the clay road district, noting that they were trying to keep the five acre rural tract feel; however, this was more of a subdivision. He opined that this was different than the pattern that the City wanted for the clay road district.

Mr. Crawford opined that it was unfair to put issues of the past on the shoulders of the present owners, and that 0.6 units per acre was a low density. He then asked about the clay road district, noting that he could not find anything designating it. He did not believe that they had any special protections in transportation concurrency, noting that the proposed development did not affect level of service. He said that the applicant would like to pave it; however, there was no way to get right of way to pave O'Brien Road to Libby Road.

Commr. Parks indicated that he was hoping to work more with the City of Groveland out of respect for the JPA.

Mr. Crawford agreed, and said that it would be another 90 days before it came back to the Board for approval, if it was approved for transmittal; furthermore, the applicant would hopefully be able to work with the City more during that process.

Commr. Campione opined that the concern was that if the Board approved it for transmittal, they would be giving the appearance that they were going in that direction. She indicated concerns for going from Rural to a higher density unless there were extenuating circumstances or if they were doing something consistent with what a City wanted. She said that she liked the idea that there should be neighborhoods where one could have larger lots without a five acre tract, and she opined that the County needed to have a conversation with the City of Groveland.

Mr. Crawford asked for the chance for him to have this conversation with a timeline where it would be transmitted within 180 days. He did not think that it would signal an approval other than the ability to understand the City's concerns and try to address them.

Commr. Smith expressed concerns that over one quarter of this property was adjacent to the City of Groveland, and that the applicant was present to try to get a PUD designation.

Mr. Crawford opined that this was what the ISBA and the JPA said that they were supposed to do.

Commr. Smith made a motion to deny this item.

Commr. Parks seconded the motion.

Commr. Smith opined that they should go to the City of Groveland, noting that the subject property was contiguous with the city and would receive City utilities; therefore, he opined that the City should have more say than the County.

Commr. Campione said that she drew a line when there was already a land use in place and they had a City that was not willing to work with a landowner, and then the County could potentially adhere and honor what rights someone already had under the County FLU map; however, this was a different scenario.

Commr. Parks opined that they would still have the chance to work with the City of Groveland, and that they could bring it back if the applicant and City wanted to.

Commr. Campione mentioned possibly going to Rural Transition, which would be one unit per acre with 50 percent open space, noting that they could lower their density for a larger lot size.

Commr. Parks said that if this was a subdivision in the county, they would have 50 percent open space which would change the lot number and sizes.

Mr. Crawford opined that changing the sizes could defeat the purpose of trying to provide larger lots. He stated that he would rather not have a denial because of the continuance fees and reapplying, and that he would like to have it transmitted. He inquired if small scale land use plan amendments were quasi-judicial, relaying his understanding that they were. He pointed out that staff had recommended that it was consistent with the code and the Comp Plan, and that there had been no testimony on anything subject to expert testimony that would refute this; therefore, he believed that the competent substantial evidence said that they should transmit this item, understanding that it did not presage a vote if it came back before the Board. He added that if the City decided to open its arms, then the applicant would be there. He also opined that a denial would hurt his negotiating power by a reasonable amount.

Commr. Parks clarified that his objection was the concerns over this essentially being a subdivision on clay roads and some of the issues that the City had raised. He added that the County had a JPA with the City, and since there had been questions from the City, he wanted to respect the JPA, noting that this was why he was supportive of the motion.

Commr. Campione opined that the clay roads seemed to be an issue, though it was indicated that there was not a deficiency in the level of service; however, it would be much maintenance on the taxpayer side.

Ms. Marsh asked if the motion to deny was without prejudice to allow the applicant to work with the City or bring back something different, noting that if it was not, then the applicant would have to wait at least one year and there had to be a substantial change.

Commr. Smith clarified that his motion was to deny outright, opining that the applicant could go to the City of Groveland.

Commr. Campione mentioned the idea that they could do this without prejudice so that it would give the applicant the opportunity to negotiate something with the City, and that the City could potentially tell the County that they were agreeable with it.

Commr. Smith opined that the applicant would have to annex into the City.

Ms. Marsh confirmed that the applicant would still be able to annex.

Commr. Campione opined that the City could possibly come back and say that they were agreeable with certain items and it staying in the county, opining that this would be the main reason to do it without prejudice. She opined that it would be in the interest of intergovernmental cooperation to do it without prejudice.

Commr. Parks opined that denying it without prejudice was fine.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks which failed by a vote of 1-3, the Board did not deny Tab 4, Rezoning Case # PZ2024-218, O’Brien Road PUD.

Commr. Parks, Commr. Morris and Commr. Campione voted no.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board denied Tab 4, Rezoning Case # PZ2024-218, O'Brien Road PUD, without prejudice.

BUTLER PROPERTY (CUP)

Mr. Fitzgerald presented Tab 5, Rezoning Case # PZ2023-318, Butler Property (CUP). He explained that the requested action was a CUP approval on approximately 2.5 acres to allow a fishing resort and a small scale recreational camp within the Rural Residential (R-1) zoning district. He recalled that the Planning and Zoning Board approved this item on their regular agenda with a vote of 5-1, and said that the location was south of Lakeshore Drive and east of Hammock Ridge Road. He stated that the concept plan depicted 2,500 total square feet of rental cabin space, a 200 square foot bathhouse, a 400 square foot store, a 600 square foot security building, a dock, boat slips, and some passive recreational areas. He relayed that the subject property was located within the Green Swamp, and that on April 9, 2025 the application had been provided to the Florida Department of Commerce, which had no comments. He mentioned that the subject property was located within the City of Clermont JPA, and that the City had commented that they would not oppose it if the CUP approved by Lake County was in compliance with the City of Clermont JPA regulations at the time of plan review. He related that geographic information systems (GIS) maps indicated that the subject parcel was located within flood zones AE and X, and he showed the wetland and floodplain overlay from the GIS map. He said that the Public Works Department provided the following conditions for development: stormwater management systems shall be designed in accordance with applicable City of Clermont JPA, Lake County and SJRWMD requirements; any development within the floodplain will require compensating storage; the cabins must be a minimum of 18 inches established above the base flood elevation; and all development should take place outside of the special flood hazard area. He stated that the proposed use was consistent with the Comp Plan portion of the Green Swamp Rural FLU, which allowed outdoor small scale recreational camps with a CUP. He added that it was also consistent with the Comp Plan item which required a 60 percent net buildable area preserved as open space, noting that this requirement would be met with approximately 81 percent open space; furthermore, it was consistent with the LDR with approval of a CUP for fishing resorts, allowance of accommodations, and accessory of sale items. He mentioned that the LDR allowed for recreational camps to be comprised of not exceeding 20 developed acres, noting that the subject parcel was around 2.5 acres. He commented that there would be the requirement of the submission of a noise assessment and environmental assessment at the time of the development submittal, and that Sunshine Water Services had provided documentation indicating the water services would be available to the subject property; additionally, a septic tank was proposed unless there was service available, noting that at the current time only water was noted as being available. He said that transportation concurrency was reviewed and that this project was noted as having a de minimis impact, and that a request for exemption from a tier one traffic analysis would be required at site plan submittal. He also relayed that Lake County Fire Station 109 was located less than one mile from the subject property.

Commr. Campione asked if the Board had disclosures.

Commr. Parks disclosed that he had spoken to Mr. Butler before the application had been submitted.

Mr. Logan Opsahl, an attorney representing the applicant, stated that the applicant had previously received approval from the State for six cabins, and had brought this to the County; furthermore, they had worked with the County to move the cabins back to allow for compensating storage and the condition to be 18 inches above the water table. He relayed that this was why they resulted in the presented plan for three cabins, and that they had State approval for this as well. He noted that there were two access points with right in, right out, and that there was a similar use historically to the west, with a residential neighborhood to the north.

Commr. Parks opined that a right in, right out was good on that road, and he asked to confirm that as one turned right in, there was an immediate right which was a dead end at the property line, which was an easement for cross access. He said that the adjacent site was supposed to be a wedding center or a meeting place, and that traffic was an issue on Lakeshore Drive due to poorly planned subdivisions in the past. He relayed that the County had a planned traffic splitter across from the Cypress Point neighborhood, and that the ideal access, if this was built, would be to go out that way. He asked if they were safe on this in the language of the ordinance.

Mr. Opsahl relayed his understanding that there was care in including this cross access, and that the applicant had been discussing this with that property owner. He also relayed that the applicant would ensure that this was clarified when they went back for the site plan.

Commr. Parks opined that this would help with traffic in the area.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved Tab 5, Rezoning Case # PZ2023-318, Butler Property (CUP).

REGULAR AGENDA

APPEAL OF PROPERTY APPRAISER'S FISCAL YEAR 2026 BUDGET

Commr. Campione recalled that Commissioner Sabatini had brought this item up, and expressed support for moving this item to the next BCC meeting when he would be present. She relayed that she was surprised that the Lake County Property Appraiser closed their office for the last part of the year, noting that she had not seen this done before; furthermore, from a real estate standpoint, many closings happened at the end of the year and many people were trying to get information. She questioned this, and opined that it was a disservice to the people of Lake County.

SILVER GLEN SPRINGS RUN ORDINANCE

Commr. Campione said that this item was for advertisement of the noise ordinance, and opined that everyone who had been impacted negatively by the noise wars at Silver Glen Springs Run were excited about the hope of this helping. She also thanked Marion County for adopting this ordinance first.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to advertise an Ordinance renumbering Section 3-5, Lake County Code, entitled Silver Glen Springs Run, to Section 5-4, Lake County Code, amending the section to designate Silver Glen Springs Run as a Noise Sensitive Zone, and providing penalties for violations.

APPOINTMENT TO THE WELLFLORIDA COUNCIL

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to appoint Ms. Tylana Hill to the WellFlorida Council as a Lake County Consumer.

CLOSED SESSION

Ms. Marsh relayed that she had previously acknowledged the need for this closed session, as authorized by Section 286.011, Florida Statutes, to discuss pending litigation against the County. She elaborated that once the closed session started, it would be confined to settlement negotiations or strategy sessions related to litigation and its expenditures. She commented that once they started, the court reporter would record the entire session from when they began to when they ended, and would include all discussions in those proceedings, including the names of all persons present at any time and whoever spoke. She added that none of the session could be off the record, and that the court reporter's notes would be transcribed and made public once the litigation was concluded. She noted that at the beginning of this session, the entity was required to give notice of who was going to be present, and that the County was required to do an advertisement, of which she had a copy in her possession. She said that the advertisement ran on December 22, 2025 in the *Daily Commercial*, and that persons who would be attending the meeting included the following: the BCC; the County Manager, Ms. Jennifer Barker; Ms. Alexis Clark, Assistant County Attorney; Mr. Ralph DeMeo, the County's outside counsel, and herself. She anticipated that as much as one hour would be spent in the session, and she asked for the audience and staff to leave, and for the recording to be turned off.

RECESS AND REASSEMBLY

At 2:34 p.m. the Chairman announced that the Closed Session had ended and that the Board Meeting was reconvened.

REPORTS

COUNTY MANAGER

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DAY

Ms. Barker mentioned that County Offices would be closed on January 19, 2026 in observance of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s Birthday.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

HAPPY NEW YEAR

Commr. Parks wished everyone a Happy New Year.

250TH BIRTHDAY OF THE COUNTRY

Commr. Parks relayed that it was the 250th year of the U.S., and opined that it called for something special to be done at the County level, as Lake County had the only Pride in America Proclamation every year and the Liberty Tree events, which were happening on a regular basis. He opined that the County should go beyond that and do something special to celebrate the 250th birthday of this country, such as placing a logo for it on the website and on letterhead and making it public that the BCC was supportive of it, and he wondered if there may be an event that the County could do with the Cities.

Commr. Campione asked if there could be a seal or sticker which said something patriotic.

Ms. Barker relayed that staff could work with the Office of Communications on some ideas.

Commr. Smith said that there could potentially be some shirts handed out at County events.

Commr. Parks added that it could be put on the County website, and that they could phase out old letterhead.

Commr. Campione mentioned that the website could have a recognition banner for Lake County celebrating the country's 250th birthday; additionally, Commissioner Smith could do a Board Shorts video on it.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

HAPPY NEW YEAR

Commr. Smith wished everyone a Happy New Year, and hoped that they could make 2026 better than what 2025 was, which he opined was great.

250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S.

Commr. Smith commented that he liked the idea of celebrating the 250th anniversary of the U.S., and said that he was in favor of events in conjunction with the Cities.

COMMISSIONER MORRIS – DISTRICT 5

PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

Commr. Morris remarked that he was proud to be an American, and that it was great to be in a country where one could voice their opinions.

HAPPY NEW YEAR

Commr. Morris wished everyone a Happy New Year.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

INTERSECTION REWORK

Commr. Campione opined that the intersection of CR 452 and CR 44 at the Fairgrounds should be reworked in relation to the Fairgrounds property as the County looked forward to its relocation.

INTERSECTION IN MARION COUNTY

Commr. Campione said that the discussion with Marion County regarding the intersection of CR 42 and CR 452 would be very well received considering how many Lake County residents used that intersection even though it was outside of Lake County.

NOISE ORDINANCE FOR SILVER GLEN RUN

Commr. Campione stated that she was excited about the noise ordinance for Silver Glen Run coming back for a public hearing, and mentioned that she had gone there and met with some property owners on the prior day. She opined that it was an amazing place, and that addressing the behavior that was harming that environment and experience would help tremendously.

HAPPY NEW YEAR

Commr. Campione wished everyone a Happy New Year, and said that she looked forward to working together to help solve some issues within the County's purview.

DITCH CLEANING IN THE ASTOR AREA

Commr. Campione mentioned that the Public Works Department had been working on creating a regular maintenance schedule for ditch cleaning in the Astor area to keep those areas cleared out, and opined that even though this would be helpful, it would not solve every flooding issue in the Astor area; however, it would create additional capacity.

EMAILS

Commr. Campione relayed that as a general rule, she tried to answer emails; however, she opined that at times, there was concern about answering an email because of the nature of the email or the tone of the dialogue.

Commr. Smith relayed that they could not answer some emails because it was quasi-judicial. He then recalled that someone had questioned the North Lake Community Park and playground, noting that this was all done by master planning. He remarked that he was on the Parks, Recreation, and Trails Advisory Committee, and opined that this was being well taken care of. He said that he could contact this individual.

Commr. Campione opined that it was a great park and that people in North Lake appreciated it.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY DAY

Commr. Smith remarked that it was National Technology Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:44 p.m.

_____

LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____

GARY J COONEY, CLERK