A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

FEBRUARY 3, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, February 3, 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; Anthony Sabatini; Kirby Smith; and Timothy Morris. Others present were: Jennifer Barker, County Manager; Melanie Marsh, County Attorney; Misty Spahn, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office; 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 Brooks Braswell, with First Baptist Church of Umatilla, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, commented that Tab 3 was added as an addendum after the agenda was first published, and requested that this be done with the public hearings.

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. Cindy Newton, a resident of Commissioner District 4, expressed appreciation to the BCC for hosting a countywide joint planning agreement (JPA) workshop on the prior day, opining that the discussion was productive, particularly regarding the transfer of development rights (TDR), which she opined was well received by the municipalities. She opined that it was encouraging to hear that Lake County had sufficient vacant land allocations to accommodate projected growth through 2050, accounting for 85 percent of landowners who did not want to develop, and noted that this aligned with the Strong Towns analysis from a few years prior, which estimated that existing entitlements would last 45 to 75 years with no increase in density or land use. She opined that the most encouraging part of the meeting was the broad agreement among City officials, staff, and the BCC that the rural and transition areas must be protected from urban level density, and that there was strong support for preserving farms and rural lands to ensure local sustainable food sources and for directing growth to the current urban areas where utilities were already available. She mentioned that several Cities acknowledged that the interlocal service boundary agreements (ISBAs) needed to be substantially revised or rebuilt to better support the protection of rural areas, and opined that everyone involved would be watched to see if the actions supported the words.

Pastor Chuck Padgett, with Trinity Assembly of God, commented that a few years prior, they offered a homeless shelter at their church, and that the reason they stopped doing the homeless shelter was because they were told by the County that they had to have a $1 million liability insurance policy with the County's name on it. He remarked that their insurance company would not do that, and opined that the County should take responsibility. He mentioned that for two weeks he had been questioned why they would not do a homeless shelter, and that even though they wanted to help the homeless, the County needed to take responsibility for them being in his church's facilities in case somebody fell at the church.

Commr. Campione expressed appreciation to them for doing that, and opined that it was helpful. She mentioned that Hope International Church in the City of Groveland and LifePointe Church in the City of Eustis had opened for the homeless, and she assumed that the Salvation Army would have opened.

Pastor Padgett remarked that the Salvation Army had called him and asked him to open up, and that he told them that if Lake County would take responsibility, then he would.

Commr. Campione questioned if the other facilities had the required insurance policies.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, indicated her understanding that there was not an agreement with the other facilities, and that they were doing it without one.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they had to assume the liability using their own policies or they had to provide for that liability by naming the County as an insured entity.

Ms. Marsh clarified that the County had facilities that were used for various reasons, and that liability insurance was required because Lake County had no control over the existing condition of the facility. She commented that an individual who had tripped on a step at a County facility that was being used for the Lake County Supervisor of Elections had sued the County because the County had control of the facility at that point in time even though the step issue was an ongoing issue with that facility, noting that the liability insurance was required because the County could not evaluate and correct any Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) deficiencies or other issues that may exist on the facility that would be a potential hazard.

Pastor Padgett indicated concerns about sidewalks being uneven and in need of repair.

Commr. Campione said that she regretted that there could not be a way to make it work, and opined that they had done good work providing the homeless shelter during cold weather before.

Commr. Morris inquired if Pastor Padgett had looked at other insurance companies.

Pastor Padgett opined that the County could inspect his facility, and that if somebody was hurt there, then he would take responsibility; however, he assured that his facility was up to code. He also expressed concerns about the traffic on Myrtle Lake Avenue and Urick Street because they just opened a new elementary school, and he asked for help to slow traffic there.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that Commissioner Morris could speak with him.

Ms. Kathryn Wright, a resident of the Town of Lady Lake, expressed concerns about sinkholes and the aquifer, noting that there was a new one in the City of Groveland which was currently 90 feet wide, 200 feet long, and 50 feet deep. She relayed her understanding that sinkholes were triggered by pumping out much water due to overdevelopment, a drought, or heavy rain, and that they were costly to infrastructure and to people. She indicated her understanding that as of January 27, 2026, 16.2 million Florida residents were in areas of drought, and that the Southwest Florida Water Management District had implemented strict watering restrictions due to low aquifer levels and drought conditions in seven counties, including Manatee, Sarasota, and Sumter Counties. She commented that according to the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD), their monthly total was less than half the monthly average, and she asked the Board to promote smart development.

Mr. David Williamson, a 2026 candidate for the BCC Commission District 4, related that he and a group of local residents were voted to assume responsibility of the Pine Lakes Community Center, and that they had started making improvements, such as new flooring, cabinets, kitchen, shelving, and appliances. He mentioned that they had received 7,000 pounds of food from Second Harvest Food Bank, which would be distributed on the current evening, and asked for guidance and assistance regarding available grants or programs that they could apply for to further revitalize the community center. He remarked that their goal was to create a dependable resource for the surrounding community, and indicated that any information would be appreciated. He also commented that as a candidate, he received a significant number of calls from residents expressing frustration that they had emailed or called the BCC but had received no response, and noted that the most common concern was the current meeting time of 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, which he opined was not accessible for working citizens. He opined that most residents could not take time off work to voice their concerns properly, and that the meetings should be held at a more practical time, such as in the evening, when working families, business owners, and citizens had a fair opportunity to participate, noting that some municipalities had done this.

Commr. Campione commented that if he sent her an email regarding the community center, she could connect him with Ms. Maria AbdoulKarim, Director for the Office of Housing and Community Services, and that they could see if there were any Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) opportunities for that, opining that the building needed much work.

Commr. Morris stated that Mr. Williamson could have those who had concerns call him if they could not get through to the County, and that if Mr. Williamson would provide a list of those people and their contact information, then he would talk to them.

Commr. Smith mentioned that his office hours were Tuesday and Thursday, and that his personal phone number was on his card, noting that Mr. Williamson could give people his number.

Commr. Campione opined that if somebody had emailed and had not received a response, then he could forward that email to the BCC.

Ms. Patty Kendrick, a resident of the City of Fruitland Park, indicated concerns about recycling and the quality of the lakes, and opined that the trash in the recycling bins was going in

with the regular trash. She also expressed concern about a real estate agent being on the Planning and Zoning Board.

Commr. Campione commented that water sampling and testing happened all over Lake County, including at the Lake County Water Authority (LCWA) and the Lake County Health Department.

Ms. Kendrick relayed her understanding that they did not test for everything, and opined that Lake Griffin had lead in it and was considered impaired.

Commr. Campione clarified that Counties and Cities often had people in the real estate industry on the Planning and Zoning Boards because they were familiar with real estate laws and issues; however, they were not allowed to make decisions on property that they had a listing on, noting that there were rules in the State of Florida about when a board member had to abstain from voting. She also indicated her understanding that the County did not use yellow bins for recycling even though they used to.

Ms. Kendrick remarked that her neighborhood still used them; however, she was told that they were supposed to replace them, noting she lived in Lakeside Terrace.

Commr. Parks stated that he would give her his email address, and that he could send her cutsheets that had factual data on recycling. He mentioned that Lake County did recycle even though it was a low percentage because much of what was placed in recycle bins was not recyclable, and that Lake County had a higher percentage of recycling compared to surrounding counties.

ANNEXATION REPORT

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, commented that there were two properties located in the City of Clermont area being annexed, and that one was for 11.8 acres of land located south of SR 50 and west of Ray Goodgame Parkway, noting that the intent was to develop the property as an industrial park with a 100-foot right of way dedication for Hooks Street. He pointed out that the property was currently Urban Low with four dwelling units per acre, and that the municipality was proposing to annex that and create an industrial park. He related that the other case was a proposal to annex approximately 10.4 acres of property located west of Hartle Road, and that the intent was to develop the property with a 25-lot residential subdivision. He stated that the property was currently Urban Low and Regional Office with four dwelling units per net acre, and that the municipality was proposing a low-density residential subdivision with three dwelling units per acre.

Commr. Campione recalled that this had come before the Board before, noting that it had industrial property on one side and low density on the other side, and that they were currently annexing and going to a lower density.

Mr. Fitzgerald mentioned that the City meeting would be on March 10, 2026 if there were any comments.

Commr. Sabatini opined that industry was good, and said that he supported this. He said that he would support writing a letter to the City of Clermont to not proceed with the high-density subdivision.

Commr. Campione clarified that Lake County's zoning was four units to the acre currently, and opined that the only people who may not like this were those who had large lots on the lake.

Mr. Fitzgerald related that the allowable development program showed that the County would allow 41 dwelling units, and that they were only proposing 25.

Commr. Parks wondered if there were any objections from the City.

Mr. Fitzgerald reiterated that both of the items would go before the City Council on March 10, 2026.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: REZONING

REZONING REGULAR AGENDA

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that there were four items on the current agenda including the following: a future land use (FLU) adoption for the Lake Yale Planned Unit Development (PUD); a rezoning for the Lake Yale PUD; a rezoning for the Schofield Road PUD; and a developer's agreement associated with the Lake Yale PUD. He displayed the advertisements for that day's rezoning cases on the overhead monitor in accordance with the Florida Statutes.

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. Sabatini commented that he had read the written record and had spoken to Mr. Carey Baker, former Lake County Property Appraiser.

Commr. Parks mentioned that he had spoken with the applicant and Mr. and Ms. Chen with the opposition.

Commr. Campione related that she had spoken to Mr. Bill Ray, Mr. Chuck Hiatt, and Mr. Cliff Whitaker, the applicant.

Commr. Smith remarked that he had spoken to Mr. Ray, Mr. Hiatt, and Mr. Whitaker, and Mr. Bruce Duncan, and that he read all the emails for and against this item.

Commr. Morris stated that he had spoken to the same people as Commissioner Smith, including Mr. Duncan and the applicant, as well as Mr. and Ms. Chen.

REZONING REGULAR AGENDA

Tab 1. Ordinance No. 2026-4
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, 50,000 square feet of commercial uses, and associated recreational facilities.

Tab 2. Ordinance No. 2026-5
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 50,000 square feet of commercial uses with associated recreational facilities.

Tab 3. Ordinance No. 2026-6
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-18
Schofield Road PUD (RZ)
Rezone approximately 47.71+/- acres from Agriculture (A) to Planned Unit Development District (PUD) to facilitate a residential subdivision; and to amend and restate Ordinance 2023-74.

LAKEYALEPUDFLUAMENDMENT,REZONING,ANDDEVELOPERSAGREEMENT

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that rezoning case # PZ2023-235, Lake Yale PUD, was brought before the Board for an FLU adoption hearing on January 6, 2026, and that it had been continued to the current BCC meeting. He relayed that the request was to amend the FLU map to change the FLU category of approximately 208 acres from Rural Transition FLU to Urban Low density to accommodate a mixed-use development that would include 1,000 active-adult residential units, 450 single-family and multi-family units, 50,000 square feet of commercial uses, and associated recreational facilities, noting that the Planning and Zoning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of this item. He commented that the location was north of County Road (CR) 452 and south of Lake Yale, and that this request was compliant with the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) because they were proposing a traditional neighborhood development in an urban land use. He stated that the PUD was designed as a multimodal community that was highly walkable and golf cart friendly, and that all streets in the community would be publicly owned and maintained through either a Community Development District (CDD), a municipal services taxing unit (MSTU), or a municipal service benefit unit (MSBU). He remarked that the development did not propose industrial, manufacturing, or office uses, and that the request was consistent with an Urban Low FLU. He mentioned that the project was located in the proximity of a collector/arterial road and would have a minimum open space of 25 percent, and that the City of Eustis had indicated that central water and sewer service would be available to the subject property. He commented that school concurrency was required, and that a proportionate share mitigation agreement may be required by the Lake County School Board; additionally, Fire Station 72 was located approximately two miles from the subject property. He said that the level of service for CR 452 had been evaluated with a traffic study, and that the increased traffic on CR 452 would cause the level of service to drop to F. He mentioned that there was a requirement for a developers agreement to be submitted with this project, and that this would be reviewed on the current day. He remarked that this item had been transmitted to the State for review, and that the State had no objections except for the transportation element. He displayed the current FLU maps, and said that if the proposal was approved, it would go from Rural Transition to Urban Low FLU. He showed the conceptual plan, and pointed out that it was a traditional neighborhood with a main street, building

out to an edge-type subdivision. He relayed that under Rural Transition, there was the option of one dwelling unit per five acres to one dwelling unit per acre depending on the open space provided, and that the proposed Urban Low FLU was up to four dwelling units per acre; however, the proposal was 3.19 units per acre with 60 percent impervious surface ratio and a 25 percent open space. He also commented that the companion ordinance to the proposal was a request to rezone 456 acres from Agriculture, Rural Residential, and Estate Residential to PUD to accommodate 1,000 active adult residential units, 450 multifamily single-family units, and 50,000 square feet of commercial and recreational facilities, noting that the Planning and Zoning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of this item. He remarked that if approved, this PUD would be compliant as a traditional neighborhood with a main street district, waterfront area, activity center, marina, active recreational facilities, multimodal streets, central utilities, trails, public parks, and civic amenities, reiterating that all streets would be maintained by a CDD, MSTU, or MSBU. He showed an aerial map of the parcels that were included and the conceptual plan, and noted that that the conceptual plan was consistent with the land development regulations (LDR), which stated that complimentary and compatible commercial uses were permitted within a PUD when they were designed in a residential community with an approved development plan. He stated that the site development standards promoted a functional compatibility of uses to promote safe and efficient circulation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and provided orderly phasing of the development, and that the Comp Plan required that this be a traditional neighborhood, which it was, and encouraged mixed use, compact design, efficient use of services, and diversification of the land uses. He related that some of the highlights of this ordinance included the following: integrated the commercial uses and recreational opportunities; provided housing choices; included dark sky lighting; required Florida friendly and Florida native landscaping; street-loaded garages were set back from the front of the house; driveways were a minimum of 25 feet to accommodate parking; and street trees were an amenity for the development. He mentioned that the property was located along CR 452 where the future Lake Yale Loop trail would be located, and that the trail location would be determined later, noting that staff would keep it in mind as they reviewed the site plan and subdivision construction plan. He showed the flood map in that area, and said that there was minimal flood risk for this property, as it was all confined to the lake area, noting that there were 1.5 acres of wetlands on the property. He commented that because this development would have a negative effect on the level of service of CR 452, the applicant was required to make some concessions for traffic improvements through a developers agreement, which included the following: a roundabout at CR 452 and Apiary Road; a roundabout at CR 452 and Fish Camp Road; an extension of turn lanes at the intersection of CR 44 and CR 452; resurfacing and widening of approximately 3,800 linear feet of Apiary Road; installation of approximately 3,800 linear feet of sidewalk along one side of Apiary Road; installation of approximately 3,800 linear feet of sidewalk along one side of Fish Camp Road; and signalization of the intersection at CR 44 and Apiary Road. He commented that these items had been moved up to coincide with phase one of the development except for the signalization of CR 44, which was at phase two; furthermore, there was a provision in the developers agreement stating

that if County staff determined that construction of the roundabout at Fish Camp Road and CR 452 was not feasible due to constraints of the right of way, then there would be an alternative considered, and that sidewalk construction on Apiary Road and Fish Camp Road would also be reevaluated if County staff considered the right of way to be restrictive.

Ms. Marsh mentioned that she had just received an email from Mr. Mark McManus, Community Planning Liaison Officer for Naval Air Station (NAS) Jacksonville, and that since he was not able to be in attendance on the current day, she would like to have his comments on the record for the Board's information. She read that as this development was outside the Pinecastle Bombing Range airspace, the United States (U.S.) Navy had no objections; however, due to the location, the future homeowners should hear and potentially feel the concussion of live ordnance from the Pinecastle Range impact area, noting that the PUD was just under 15 miles from the impact area and the noise and vibrations may travel as far as 20 miles. She read that there was a ruling by the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida that applied to this development, and that per the *Virgilio vs Ryland Group* decision in 2010, when a seller of a home knows the facts materially affecting the value of the property, which were not readily observable and are not known to the buyer, the seller is under a duty to disclose them to the buyer. She read that the *Virgilio* ruling specifically referenced the Pinecastle Range and the potential for unexploded ordnance, chemical residues, and other potential hazards resulting from the bombing there, and that even though a potential homeowner could use the internet to see that there was an airport, racetrack, or stadium near their future home, they would not likely see the Pinecastle Range impact area and conclude that it was a live ordnance impact area; additionally, they asked that the applicant would acknowledge a duty to disclose the Pinecastle Range to buyers. She requested that this be added to the ordinance if this was approved on the current day that they would have to disclose that information.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that when the FLU map amendment was sent to the State, they had referenced the transportation issue, and that the developers agreement was proposed to remedy that.

Mr. Fitzgerald indicated that this was correct.

Commr. Campione pointed out that the language regarding the Fish Camp Road roundabout mentioned that it could be revisited along with the sidewalk, noting that ensuring that there was a sidewalk on Fish Camp Road available was important to her. She commented that if there was not sufficient right of way, she wanted to ensure that the language would provide that at such time as the County was able to acquire the right of way, the sidewalk would be constructed by the developer.

Mr. Fitzgerald read what was in the developers agreement, as follows: "Sidewalk construction preconditions the event that County staff determines prior to commencement of construction of Phase 1 of the developer's project that the Apiary Road sidewalk and/or Fish Camp Road sidewalk cannot be constructed due to the existing public right of way not being of necessary width, then the developer's obligation to construct such improvements shall be deferred to

commencement of the next phase of the developer's project that follows the County's acquisition of the necessary public right of way."

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, and several members of the Whitaker family, and that he had a brief presentation to provide some updates on what they had done since the previous public hearing of this item. He related that the overall project was 456 acres in size and was not located within the Emeralda Marsh Rural Protection Area (RPA) but was within the County's economic development overlay district, which had been adopted in the Comp Plan, and that the overlay district was created to attract targeted industries to develop their facilities in the county. He mentioned that even though the development would not meet this standard, the overlay included the entirety of the project, including what was in the Urban Low FLU and what was being proposed to be brought into the Urban Low FLU on the current day, and that the proposal was to unify that FLU designation and to allow for a mixed-use traditional neighborhood design project to be developed under a PUD zoning. He commented that they had evaluated the feedback that was shared from the Board and the public and had implemented several changes, including a reduction of residences from 1,600 to 1,450 and an expansion and acceleration of the transportation improvements being proposed prior to the first phase of the project and prior to the first resident moving into a home, including the construction of the roundabouts and the sidewalks along one side of Fish Camp Road and Apiary Road, which would start at the roundabouts and extend down those roads to CR 44, connecting this community with the area and providing options for people to walk into the community. He remarked that the project remained a mixed-use master planned community and included the following: eight phases; three neighborhood districts required by the Comp Plan, such as the neighborhood edge, neighborhood transition, and the neighborhood core district; and a commercial component in the main street core and along the lakefront district, which was in Phases 4A and 4B, noting that this was where the dining and retail experiences would be available for the community and the surrounding area. He related that they reduced the number of residences in the later phases of the project, such as Phases 5, 6, and 8, which were in the areas subject to the Comp Plan amendment, reducing the density in those areas to less than 2.5 dwelling units per acre, and noted that this reduction in density could act as a transition between the edge of this project and the remaining Rural Transition FLU adjacent to it. He stated that the acceleration of some of the offsite infrastructure made by the developer of this project embraced the " Infrastructure Now, Development Later" mantra, and that it would start with the construction of over three miles of a central sewer utility line at a considerable cost so that this community would be serviced by central water and sewer. He relayed that there would be miles of additional sewer improvements internal to the community, and that there was also an opportunity to oversize the central sewer to provide a potential connection for other areas in this part of the county. He commented that there would be turn lane improvements made at the intersection of CR 452 and CR 44, which would be completed prior to the first phase of the development, and that the roundabouts where Apiary Road and Fish Camp Road intersected with CR 452 would both be

completed prior to the first phase of the development. He mentioned that the sidewalks along Apiary Road and Fish Camp Road as well as the widening and resurfacing of Apiary Road from CR 452 to CR 44 would be completed prior to the first phase of development, and that the signal on CR 44 and Apiary Road would be done after the second phase of the development. He stated that after the second phase of the development, all of the improvements would be made, and opined that constructing the infrastructure first and the development later was the new way to develop in the county. He displayed a chart showing the total cost of all the improvements, and said that all of the existing public roads within the community, including portions of Fish Camp Road, Lake Yale Circle, and Apiary Road, would be completely reconstructed at a significant investment. He opined that most if not all of those roads were currently substandard, and pointed out that they would be reconstructed and brought up to the County's current standards as part of this project at a considerable cost to the developer. He commented that there would also be right of way dedications made to allow for those improvements to take place and to allow for the roundabouts to be constructed, and that there would be additional dedications made along the CR 452 frontage to allow for future improvement of those areas. He mentioned that some of the feedback from the prior meeting dealt with the transportation impact analysis (TIA) that had been prepared for this project to support the development agreement, and that they wanted to clarify the following: it was prepared in accordance with Lake County TIA guidelines and the Lake-Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) protocols; it utilized the most recent available data at the time of the study's preparation, which included the 2023 Lake County Congestion Management Process (CMP) Database and the 2024 Lake County Annual Counts Database; it utilized annual growth rates for road segments solely based on historical traffic counts data, not the population growth, consistent with approved methodology and accepted industry standards; it applied a minimum annual growth rate of two percent, which he opined was a conservative approach, noting that if there were road segments that had a growth rate that was less than two percent, then those road segments were put into the model at two percent; and it had been reviewed and accepted by County staff to confirm it was prepared in accordance with the approved methodology. He opined that there had been some mischaracterizations of the TIA in the comments, such as the assertion that all Lake County roads evaluated had a current level of service rating of D currently, and that this was not accurate. He explained that level of service D, which was reflected in the TIA and certain tables, was the level of service standard adopted by the County and was still considered a safe and efficient standard, and that the County applied this scale to measure roads that were operating at this standard, noting that anything lower was considered not to be a safe and efficient standard. He related that the TIA included tables that presented the existing level of service for the study's roadway segments, showing that only one segment of CR 44 between CR 473 and Apiary Road was currently operating below a level of service D, and that all remaining segments evaluated were operating at or above this standard. He remarked that another assertion was made to expect Goose Prairie Road to be utilized as a shortcut and inundated during rush hours; however, the TIA evaluated Goose Prairie Road and showed that even though traffic was expected to utilize it during the day and the evening rush hour, Goose Prairie Road was expected to operate at level of service C

at full project buildout in 2037 with about 50 percent of available road capacity. He mentioned that there had been additional letters of support submitted with no objections from 19 property owners with 32 parcels, and noted that they were adjacent to the project boundary or in the immediate vicinity. He opined that there was community buy-in to the project locally, and that the community could see that the unified design was a benefit and provided certainty of how the area would be developed in the future, showing that there had been much community outreach and communication throughout the process. He relayed that some of the benefits provided by this project included the following: it was master planned consistent with the Comp Plan and LDR, which would avoid a piecemeal approach to future development of the parcels involved; it would be serviced by central sewer and water as well as a master stormwater system; there was a reduction in the number of residences adjacent to the Rural Transition areas; there was an "Infrastructure Now, Development Later" mantra accommodated by accelerating the offsite transportation improvements and central utilities; there would be reconstruction of portions of the existing public road network to current County standards that would come at a significant cost to the owner; the new internal road network would be maintained through a community financing mechanism, such as a CDD, MSTU, or MSBU; significant right of way dedications would be made at no cost to the County; there would be substantial impact fees paid by the developer; there would be a substantial increase in annual ad valorem tax revenues, resulting in an efficient delivery of government services; there was significant neighbor support from those people who would be most impacted; and throughout the inception, it had been an owner driven process as it was a legacy project. He remarked that it had taken much time, effort, and funding to reach this point, and he asked that the Board would support this request.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that there was a map that dated back to the 1991 Comp Plan adoption with the original Lake County FLU map, and inquired if he could discuss that.

Mr. Huels showed a map of the 1991 FLU map, and said that the Grand Island area was originally designated as Urban and Urban Expansion. He mentioned that at that time, there were much greater densities permitted to be developed on these properties, and that the majority of the land was owned by the family at that time. He commented that a later version of that map showed greater densities being permitted in the Rural Transition area before the rewrite of the Comp Plan in 2011, and noted that it allowed three dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Ray stated that in 1991, this area was envisioned to be developed at a higher density of three units per acre, and that the Urban Expansion areas were up to five units per acre, opining that they supposed that Grand Island was going to become a community and planned forward. He related that moving forward, there was the 2007 through 2009 FLU map, and that the Rural Transition area became Suburban, which was three dwelling units per acre with open space and design requirements. He commented that the 2011 Comp Plan took those property rights away from the landowners and placed the land under the new creation of the Rural Transition FLU, which was one unit per acre to one unit per five acres, and noted that the 2011 Comp Plan was also inconsistent with some of the adjacent uses to the west that were already developed at densities

exceeding three units per acre that now had an FLU of Rural. He relayed that they wanted to correct those with the proper use of Urban Low to recapture what the development rights were before they were lost.

Commr. Campione questioned if they had a map showing the densities to the west around the property.

Mr. Ray pointed out that the developments to the west included the following: Lake Yale Estates, which had a density of approximately four units per acre; Palm Shores, which had a density of 6.34 units per acre; and Quail Ridge, which had a lower, more suburban density of 2.3 units per acre, noting that they were all on septic tanks.

Commr. Campione commented that even though the FLU map showed that this was a R ural FLU, the actual development pattern was consistent with an Urban FLU.

Mr. Ray mentioned that Commissioner Parks was originally involved with the mapping, and that even though he had raised those topics before, he was overridden by the Board that was preparing the maps.

Commr. Campione opined that it was an issue at the time because they were not considering what was already in existence and did not incorporate that into the map that was being adopted; therefore, she opined that there was currently a Rural Transition area that was actually between two Urban Low areas.

Mr. Ray remarked that from the conception of this project, the Whitakers wanted to ensure that agriculture was an allowed use within all phases of the PUD, and that it was envisioned that an agricultural component be associated with the open space, which was 113 acres. He opined that moving forward, there could be neighborhood agriculture and community gardens, and noted that it was not the intent to abandon the past or heritage of Lake County.

Commr. Campione asked if Mr. Cliff Whitaker, the owner, was willing to speak about the situation that happened in the previous weekend, some history about the family's use of the property, and how long they had been on the property.

Mr. Ray related that this was the second time they had gone through freezes in the climate that had affected their livelihood, and that the first time was in the 1980s. He commented that they were one of the remaining families that had continued to hang on by trying innovative techniques.

Commr. Campione commented that some public comment had been submitted claiming that this was not legacy property, and opined that this should be addressed by the family.

Mr. Whitaker expressed his beliefs about Jesus Christ, and said that this prior weekend had brought back memories from a long time ago. He commented that he started working with his family after graduating from the University of Florida with an accounting degree to help the family business; however, in 1985 there was a devastating freeze, which he opined was even worse than the freezes in 1983 and 1989. He related that they lost everything at that time, and that this previous weekend they lost their entire citrus and blueberry crops. He mentioned that he spent the first 20 years of his career planting orange trees and putting in irrigation systems, which required hard manual labor, trying to replant what the prior two generations had accumulated and given him the

opportunity to do. He stated that his family had never given up, as they were one of the last families in the industry, and that this property would have been developed long ago if he had not taken the risk to go into the blueberry business, which had allowed him to subsidize his citrus business and stay in farming as long as he had, opining that if he had stayed in just the citrus business, he would have had to sell the property to pay their bills. He commented that they were currently at that same juncture again, starting with a loss of capital that was going to cause him to walk away from his citrus business entirely, noting that the citrus prices had already collapsed. He opined that there would be niches in agriculture that would survive; however, due to Federal law and trade agreements, he could not compete with third-world countries. He opined that they had stayed in business as long as they could and been good stewards of the land, and that even though he wanted to stay in farming, he could not unless the economics changed.

Commr. Campione inquired how the freeze had affected his blueberries.

Mr. Whitaker replied that his entire blueberry crop was gone, and indicated appreciation for the people that God had placed in his life, which had given him the opportunity to farm the previous 10 years. He related that after this weekend, his life had changed, as well as the lives of his employees, who had worked with him side-by-side for his whole career, noting that nobody had ever left him. He commented that he had put his whole heart and soul into this and his family for three generations; however, there would not be a fourth generation, as nobody in his family wanted to take the risk to farm. He relayed that they had started in Grand Island with five acres in 1960 on the corner of Apiary Road and CR 452 when Apiary Road was a dirt road, and that none of these people were out there, noting that he was welcoming and wanted neighbors. He remarked that they were able to accumulate more property, and that if they sold something off the farm, they bought something adjacent to their farm, which had been the case since he had been in business.

Commr. Campione expressed appreciation to Mr. Whitaker, and opined that it was a difficult time to discuss it; however, she opined that it was important for everyone to hear him.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Dawn Luciano, a resident of the Grand Island area, opined that the TIA was not accurate, and indicated concerns about traffic and the impacts this may have on her development.

Ms. Kendrick wondered how the Whitakers could have spent many years planning for this legacy project when they had still been farming until the prior weekend when it had been freezing, which made it so they could not farm any longer. She mentioned that she had grown up on a farm that had been sold to a developer, and that the children had obtained their funds, the developer had made funds, and that there were 50 year old trees there currently. She expressed concern about congestion and uncontrolled growth, and opined that according to a survey, people wanted natural beauty, preservation, better roads, and protection of water quality. She opined that developers did not care about the residents, and that building 1,500 more houses was a bad idea for that area, as it was rural, on a lake, and next to a marsh.

Commr. Morris asked Ms. Kendrick if she lived near CR 452, and how many years she had lived there.

Ms. Kendrick answered that she lived in the City of Fruitland Park, and had lived there for about four years.

Mr. Charles Bowen, a resident of Lake County, indicated concerns about traffic on CR 452 and water usage.

Mr. Ryan Atwood, a resident of the City of Mount Dora, mentioned that he was a local blueberry and strawberry grower, and that he was in favor of this project. He opined that being a farmer was difficult, and said that he wanted to see people doing the best job possible in developing the community by having nice projects. He opined that this project was well thought out, and that the Whitakers had allocated much time and many resources into it. He opined that in the urban/rural interface, nobody wanted growth; however, he opined this county had become a commuter community for the City of Orlando. He opined that change was a constant, and that the sentiment on social media was that people did not want this in their backyard, as they wanted the land to remain rural. He pointed out that a farmer's business was the land, and opined that they should be able to sell the business and retire, noting that this was the Whitakers' retirement. He opined that voting for this project would help at least one farmer in the community, and that the rest of them would continue on and do the best they could.

Mr. Scott Randall, a resident of Lake County, remarked that he was a beekeeper, and that his family had been tied to all these farms for four generations. He opined that this was a bad year for farming, and that citrus should not be planted this far north. He pointed out that there had been many freezes in the past, and opined that this should not be used as an excuse for this project. He indicated concerns about adjacent properties being changed to Urban Low, and opined that they should follow what the land was zoned for.

Mr. Williamson recounted events from the previous public hearing of this item, and gave definitions for mob rule, concerned citizens, authoritarianism, and tyranny. He mentioned that the BCC had repeatedly stated its opposition of rezoning across Lake County, and opined that the citizens speaking against this item deserved to be heard. He also opined that the applicant should reduce the number of homes down to 1,200, which the property was already zoned for.

Mr. Justin Sayre, a resident of the Grand Island area, expressed his support for this zoning change, and noted that his property was adjacent to one of the proposed phases. He opined that even though he grew up playing and riding four-wheelers in that area, growth was inevitable especially when there were four major metropolitan areas within a two-hour drive. He indicated concerns about the traffic, and pointed out that this project was offering needed adjustments to roadways before construction projects were started. He expressed concern about how to ensure that the change was beneficial to the area, and opined that building 1,200 homes, which it was currently zoned for, required very little traffic control and added no real value to the area. He opined that this project brought something new and creative to the area with a small downtown feel and green spaces, and that the alternative was 1,000 houses by different builders. He opined that the residents that lived in the zoning change area must do what was right for their property, and asked the following questions: was there a current traffic issue that was the fault of this project; did the project offer relief to a preexisting traffic issue; did the zoning change add value to the

area; which type of future would people rather have for that area, and would they prefer rooftops and walled subdivisions or a waterfront area; what would they do if they owned this land and it was no longer profitable; and if they had spent the prior 50 years working, would they not want to retire. He opined that this project was about more than just funding, as it would leave behind something for the people to enjoy and would honor those who had blessed all of them with beautiful views for many years.

Mr. Joe Fumasi, a resident of Lake County, indicated concern about the fiscal impact listed on the current day's agenda for the developers agreement, and noted that it gave over $3 million in impact fee credits from the North Central Transportation Benefit District. He questioned why the developers agreement was added as an addendum agenda item rather than being part of the regular agenda for full public scrutiny, and relayed his understanding that this agreement would allow the developers to spend about $1.6 million while receiving over $3 million in credits. He opined that receiving credits provided a way for developers to bypass cash payments to the County, and that large-scale project developers were being paid for infrastructure that should be the cost of doing business. He urged the Board to provide more transparency on how this amount was verified before handing out millions of dollars in credits, and opined that the County could not afford to subsidize private developers at the expense of taxpayers. He also mentioned that his thoughts and prayers were with the farmers for the difficulties they were going through currently.

Commr. Campione explained that because developers were required under proportionate share by Florida law to do offsite improvements because of the level of service issue, they were allowed to use the impact fees they would otherwise pay, and they received credit back for paying for the offsite improvements, noting that the County was not handing out funds.

Mr. Fumasi opined that there were new rules for particular things that included soft costs, which was not normally in those types of agreements.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that there were not any issues with soft costs in the current item, and that the reason the developers agreement was an addendum item was because the developer offered to make changes and make additional infrastructure improvements.

Ms. Barker clarified that the developers agreement was part of the agenda when it was originally heard in the prior month, and that it was inadvertently left off the current day's agenda at the first publishing.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that nothing had changed other than the additional concessions the developer offered to give.

Commr. Parks commented that developers could also go above and beyond what they were receiving credit for, such as the one on Lakeshore Drive.

Ms. C.J. Blancett, a resident of the City of Leesburg, stated that as Chairman of the Lake County Chapter of the Constitution Party of Florida, she believed that representatives should be morally grounded and constitutionally sound. She opined that the rural and agricultural areas were traditional communities, and that those who chose to live there did not wish to have that disturbed for thousands of outsiders and revenue for developers, noting that she lived two miles from this development. She pointed out that reasons had been given as to why this development should be

grandfathered-in even though the area had been changed to what it was currently, and that the Whitaker family held about 69 properties, opining that they were trading farming for real estate, which was their prerogative. She also expressed concerns about Florida Sunshine Law violations.

Commr. Campione mentioned that this issue was raised at a previous BCC meeting, and asked Ms. Marsh to explain how Florida Sunshine Law tied into an allegation that a campaign donation affected the right to participate in a public hearing, and how Florida Sunshine Law applied to this type of meeting.

Ms. Marsh explained that the Sunshine Law stated that the members of an elected body could not speak to each other without there being minutes, being held in an area that was publicly accessible, and being properly advertised, noting that members of the BCC could not discuss items coming before this Board with each other without meeting those three requirements. She elaborated that Sunshine Law did not prohibit a member of the BCC from meeting with residents or opposition about issues that may come to this Board, and that ex parte communication was allowed under State law, which allowed members of this Board to meet individually with applicants or opposition on quasi-judicial cases. She stated that regarding campaign contributions, there was some very clear case law that said that a campaign contribution did not disqualify an elected official from performing their duties, including sitting on this Board and making decisions on quasi-judicial matters.

Commr. Campione opined that alleging that someone was breaking the law was serious, and said that she wanted it clarified on the record, opining that the Board took their jobs seriously. She remarked that there was always clapping at the BCC meeting for employees and school children receiving recognition; however, this was not allowed at public zoning hearings, opining that it was an issue of decorum. She opined that the BCC tried very hard to be consistent in following the rules, and that clapping was not allowed in zoning cases because of the environment it created.

Ms. Newton questioned what the developer would do if the City of Eustis lacked the capacity to provide water and sewer services or if this service would reduce the level of service for the existing users. She opined that these properties could be developed according to the existing land use and zoning, and that it did not require the Whitakers to stay in farming. She pointed out that the properties were only partially located within the City of Eustis JPA, and that when the JPA was being negotiated for adoption in 1987, this area was designated to remain rural by both parties. She commented that in 2010, this was designated at 2.5 dwelling units per acre by the County and the City of Eustis, and that what was negotiated later and incorporated in the County's FLU map did not include the City's designation, opining that having this rural land gave the Cities a reason to say "no" to annexation and service. She opined that the application to rezone property to add to the existing PUD did not have any provision that would prevent the same approach from being applied to adjacent properties recently purchased by the landowners or by the supporters, and that there was no safeguard preventing this PUD from serving as a precedent for changing the FLU and zoning on adjacent properties within the rural transition area, which she opined would erode this rural area even further.

Mr. Cornelius Caldwell, a resident of Lake County, related that he wanted to speak for the Whitaker family and all the citrus growers and farmers in Lake County, and noted that he was a sixth-generation citrus grower in the State of Florida. He opined that farming was difficult, and that farmers were currently under pressure to develop their property, as there was no other way out because of the market and labor costs. He opined that few people understood what the prior few nights had done to the Whitaker family, to all the other citrus growers in Lake County, and to his family, noting that he would have to make decisions that would be best for them. He opined that it was not fair for someone to tell this family or his family what could be done with their property, and that they should have the option to develop their property. He opined that this development would be good for the community and the former employees, and that the Whitakers had done their due diligence. He opined that the Whitakers were out of options, and he asked that the Board approve this project, opining that he may also have to face this situation sometime in the future.

Mr. Brian Wisenbaugh, a resident of Lake County, opined that it was quiet on Lake Yale, and that it was a beautiful area. He indicated concerns about traffic on CR 452, opining that there would have to be improvements. He also opined that this project would overpopulate the lake.

Ms. Diane Whitaker, an owner of the subject property, stated that her husband, Mr. John Whitaker, was a second-generation farmer and business owner for 65 years in Lake County, and that she was an artist with a master's degree in art therapy, opining that she may see this differently. She opined that this was a winning situation for Lake County, as this project would manage the growth and prevent cookie-cutter housing, and that it would provide high inventory and tax revenue for Lake County. She commented that even though people wanted cheap food prices, the farmers could no longer compete, and that there were diseases, such as greening, and freezes, noting that their Valencia oranges were completely frozen as well as the blueberries. She commented that since they had to sell their farm, they had tried diligently to make this project appealing to the neighbors, and that the lakefront had many century-old oak trees and groves of bamboo that had been preserved; additionally, the Whitaker family southern home would be included in the sale of this property. She related that the Whitaker family had already spent millions of dollars on the infrastructure and would like to see some of that investment returned, and that they wanted to provide pensions and housing for long-time employees. She pointed out that traffic issues would be addressed, and opined that traffic could be alleviated if all tractor trailers traveled on the interstates and did not deliver to municipalities during daylight hours, which had worked in other countries. She asked the BCC to support this well-planned community, and opined that it would be a premiere community that Lake County could be proud of, benefiting citizens for many years to come.

Ms. Wright opined that this project could be better, and that even though it was stated that the Whitakers had owned the land for many generations, several of those parcels were bought through the decades. She commented that it was said that Mr. Whitaker and other family members had been working on this project for most of the current decade; however, she opined that this project was not good for this area for multiple reasons. She relayed her understanding that the

Whitakers also had businesses in the Cities of Umatilla, Leesburg, and Tavares, as well as in the Grand Island area, and inquired if this project would force the other local residents to connect to the central sewer system, which she opined would be very expensive. She questioned what would happen to the multi-generational families with businesses, such as the honey farmer, and opined that the Whitakers could build houses without the Board allowing the change from Rural Transition to Urban Low density. She opined that property bought in 2024 could also be added into the development, and that this legacy project would do more harm than good.

Mr. Alan Chen, a resident of Treasure Island Road, indicated concerns about the traffic study, and opined that the traffic improvements would be meaningless. He opined that the Lake County taxpayers would pay the price for any questionable decisions made, and asked the Board to deny the request.

Ms. Louise Chen, a resident of Treasure Island Road in the City of Leesburg, opined that the Lake Yale PUD would only be the first stage of the development, and expressed concerns about more properties in this area being developed in future stages. She opined that the Rural Transition and Rural FLU needed to be safeguarded from development, and asked the Board to reject this application. She commented that she was not opposed to development in the Urban Low FLU, noting that there had been a legacy farm in her family for nearly 100 years.

Mr. Paul Kolterman, a resident of the Grand Island area, mentioned that he had a farm on the south side of CR 452 adjacent to the Wedgewood subdivision, and opined that the Whitakers were an honorable family. He relayed his understanding that the Whitakers had planned an exit strategy as many farmers did, and that the plan was in phases ending in 2037, which was 12 years. He opined that the roads would be safer, that it would create jobs, and that it would help with taxes, noting that it would be done over time. He opined that residents needed to be level-headed about growth and have a plan in place, and he indicated appreciation to the Whitakers for putting a plan in place that made sense and was well thought out as opposed to being done haphazardly as many things had been done in the past before there were good zoning laws.

Mr. Steve Shaluta, a resident of the Grand Island area, expressed concerns about traffic on Goose Prairie Road and about any environmental effects this project may have on Emeralda Marsh.

Mr. Michael Hill, a resident of the City of Eustis, opined that smart growth was important, and that some middle ground should be found, which he opined had been done with this project. He stated that he was a fourth-generation farmer in the State of Florida, and that he was in the blueberry business. He relayed that he had a packing house on Jones Avenue where they packaged a large percentage of the State of Florida's crops, and that it was his job to ensure that it was sold for the highest price, noting that he traveled the world to see what the competition was. He commented that this project would hurt his business because of the loss of blueberries; however, he did not know how much longer this business would last because of the competition from other countries, noting that costs continued to climb, including labor costs. He opined that Mr. Whitaker was a phenomenal grower, and that he had put as much time into this project and into doing it right as he had his farm. He opined that the prior Sunday was the worst day of his life, and that it would take three to five years to replant.

Ms. Barbara Morris, a resident of Commission District 4, indicated concerns about out-of-control growth, and opined that even though Mr. Whitaker could build 1,200 homes, he should not increase the density. She also opined that the Board needed to start listening to the citizens.

Ms. Linda O'Donnell, a resident of Fish Camp Road, related that she was a retired professional that developed, consulted, and managed PUDs, and opined that the plans that the Whitaker family had outlined were flawless. She mentioned that her property was adjacent to the Whitaker's property, and that even though she would be impacted by this development she was looking forward to having neighbors and a town center.

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

Mr. Huels clarified that the visioning exercise for the PUD started a few years prior, noting that it took time to put together a plan of this nature and much thought, and that this was done years before a formal application was made. He mentioned that it had gone through a process of being reviewed by staff where comments were provided and changes were made, and that this happened well before this came before the first public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Board and the BCC for the adoption phase. He commented that it had been directed by the family and what they wanted to see as well as by comments and feedback, noting that it was different than what they had originally proposed. He remarked that the developers agreement required that the developer build about $4.9 million of infrastructure improvements, receiving in return about $3 million in impact fee credits, noting that there were tangible improvements being made instead of just a check going to the County for a future road project. He opined that CR 452 was not currently safe, and that the roundabouts would make a difference in the safety of that road, noting that those would be completed before the first resident moved into the community. He pointed out that the developer would privately fund the extension of the central sewer line, and that if the central sewer could not be completed or if there was not sufficient capacity, then the project would not move forward, noting that it was a requirement of the PUD ordinance. He relayed that the Comp Plan said that a project with this many homes would need to be serviced by central sewer and water, and opined that developing the area on a piecemeal basis may not trigger that mandate, resulting in septic tanks, which he opined was not a good outcome for Lake Yale. He stated that there was no intention of having future stages or FLU amendments to bring additional property into the Urban Low designation, and that even though the family had acquired several parcels in 2024 that were adjacent to this project, they would remain in Rural Transition. He commented that all the parcels included in the Comp Plan amendment had been owned since at least 2007, and that the Whitakers had owned those parcels when they were subject to the Comp Plan maps that allowed for additional density of up to three dwelling per acre at that time. He remarked that the PUD currently had those areas at a density of less than 2.5 units per acre and would have met those standards, opining that it rectified the wrong of dividing the FLU of the parcels that the Whitakers owned when the 2011 Comp Plan was done. He opined that this process had worked, that there had been much time and effort in planning this, and that it had real tangible benefits for the community.

Commr. Smith questioned if the City of Eustis was planning on running any pipe for the possibility of water reuse when the water and sewer were connected.

Mr. Huels answered that they were not.

Commr. Sabatini stated that he had consistently voted against all new large Comp Plan amendments, and opined that even though the current Comp Plan could be better, this amendment would make it worse. He commented that he would vote against this item on the current day, opining that Lake County did not need another city. He relayed his understanding that if this project went through, it would have twice the population of the Town of Howey-in-the- Hills, and opined that even though the property was very valuable and would remain high value, the Board was being asked to make it more valuable. He opined that the State of Florida and Lake County had done a poor job planning for growth and for the future, and reiterated that he would vote against this project and encouraged the Board to vote against it as well.

Commr. Campione opined that it was fundamentally wrong to ignore the rule of law, planning documents, and the fact that this family had put much work into this property. She commented that years prior, they had participated in land use planning, and that the Whitakers had land uses on the map currently, noting that tyranny was when rights were taken away from people. She remarked that this was an applicant who originally came in with a proposal containing more lots and fewer concessions, and that the applicant made many compromises in response to comments by the Board and residents. She related that the compromises were all made on their side, and opined that everybody else still wanted it to be rejected. She mentioned that the Whitakers had the right to 1,200 units on this property, and that they could separate the property into small parcels and bring each of those parcels in as subdivision plats, noting that if the County denied them, then they could be sued, noting that the County was recently sued for a rezoning that was denied in Urban Low when the density being requested was not granted. She opined that there would still be development, including on the Whitaker property; therefore, she opined that the County had to be prudent, responsible, and mindful of the rule of law. She commented that the Urban Low FLU was there, and that they were requesting for the Rural Transition to be changed to Urban Low so they could do a master plan. She asked if the County should ignore that request and allow the development to come in as piecemeal, opining that there would then be many different subdivisions with no master plan and no roundabouts to address the speeding on CR 452. She remarked that her family had lived in this area her entire life, and that she knew about the speeding and the accidents. She opined that for 250 units more than what the Comp Plan allowed currently, the County should not give up the opportunity to have two roundabouts built on CR 452, and that even though it would be popular to deny everything, it would be a disservice to everyone living in that area to not take the opportunity to obtain those roundabouts and slow down the traffic. She opined that it would be a disservice to the community if developers built many piecemeal subdivisions without the nice amenities the Whitakers were willing to offer as part of this process, and that even though there were several people in attendance who opposed this project, there were also many residents in the area who would welcome it and would rather see it master planned and nicely done with the improvements. She mentioned that that she had received

several emails and phone calls asking for a sidewalk on Fish Camp Road, and noted that the City of Eustis had recently approved a Dairy Queen by the 7-11 gas station on CR 44, opining that it would be nice for people living on Fish Camp Road to use a sidewalk to go to the Dairy Queen or to go to this development. She opined that the proposed sidewalks on Apiary Road and Fish Camp Road were much needed improvements that could possibly save lives in the future in return for the 250 extra units. She pointed out that the property used to have a higher density on it when they bought the property, and that it was taken away in 2011, opining that this was an opportunity to right that wrong. She stated that she was in favor of protecting the rural boundaries in the rural land uses, and opined that Rural Transition served an important purpose because it placed lower density between the urban and rural land uses, which was one dwelling unit per five acres. She opined that development patterns mattered in good planning, and that the issue with this Rural Transition designation was that it did not make sense because there was high density in that area even though the mobile home parks and the manufactured home community were built many years prior. She elaborated that the Rural Transition was supposed to be the step before going to Rural; however, she opined that in this area, it was only a designation on the map, as the actual area did not look Rural. She opined that it was only fair to look at what had happened to this property and what the family had done with the property, and that it was arbitrary to pretend that the land next to the Rural Transition was Rural when it was not, but was four to six units per acre. She asked if the people wanted to have 1,200 units without the improvements, such as sidewalks, when for 250 units more, they could obtain the improvements and the infrastructure, opining that since there would be growth, the only question was whether it would be high quality or not. She commented that her rationale was about fairness, rule of law, honoring this family and the commitment they made to the community, recognizing the difficulty with farming this property, and the fact that they had those land uses for many years that the County took away, noting that the Whitakers were just asking for something consistent with what had been there since 1991 on the FLU map.

Commr. Parks expressed appreciation to the public for participating in their local government and for their concerns about growth, noting that he shared those same concerns. He also indicated appreciation to the landowners for attending, and offered his sympathies for the freezes, noting that there had been a total loss of crops. He opined that to help the farmers, one could buy Florida Fresh and ask grocers to sell locally grown Florida Fresh produce, and that even though it would be more expensive, it would be worth it. He opined that this case presented a difficult situation, and that he understood both sides. He commented that a question he had from the prior public hearing about the phasing plan had been explained better, opining that it contemplated a transition and indicated that the developer understood some of the concerns about what would happen to adjacent properties 20 years from the current day. He opined that doing the transportation improvement upfront was a large deal, as there were concerns about this, and that this was not typical even though it should have been that way many years prior. He remarked that the developer was going above and beyond what the impact fee was with a difference of about $1.5 million of what would have been collected, which provided a large time value to funds savings for the County, and opined that if this was to be developed in a piecemeal fashion, then none of

that would have occurred, resulting in the taxpayers paying for it in the future as had happened in south Lake County. He relayed his understanding that the family was doing this and not a publicly traded homebuilder, which he opined was very different than what was typically seen, and said that he had become skeptical of out-of-town builders and wanted to confirm that this was not the case. He mentioned that the developments already in that area had not been approved by any member of the current BCC, as this had occurred many years prior, and opined that this was piecemeal growth, which he wanted to avoid. He opined that even though growth was out of control, home-rule was being eroded at the State level, and that many people were moving to the State of Florida. He opined that respecting property rights was difficult, and noted that even though some people would disagree with him, he had evaluated it and wanted to get the best out of it. He stated that he was supportive of moving forward because of the following reasons: the applicant had come down about 200 units since the prior public hearing; they were proposing a traditional neighborhood design development; there was some compelling evidence that it was in an economic development overlay district, which required intensive public investment from the project; the internal rate of capture was about 20 to 30 percent, which was a percentage of the extra trips that would stay internal by taking a golf cart or walking; and the 1991 and 2007 FLU maps that were presented provided a compelling argument that they had a previous entitlement expectation, which Mr. Whitaker had been upfront about and had wanted to obtain the best result from this even back then.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that an extra 250 homes would result in the County obtaining a deal where roads were going to be redone and infrastructure improved, and opined that the benefits outweighed the cost of the 250 homes.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that if this project was not approved, then 1,200 homes would be built, and that if they were built under the current zoning, then there would be no central sewer and water, no sidewalks or pedestrian improvements, and no road impacts or traffic calming solutions. He relayed his understanding that the FLU map was redone in 2011, which changed the zoning on the properties, and said that it would be different for him if the property was grandfathered in under that map; however, he felt that he had an ethical obligation to stand by the transition zones established by staff.

Commr. Sabatini commented that the entitled 1,200 homes was the maximum they could try to get; however, he opined that with the open space requirements and the way they platted the subdivisions, they would not get that many homes. He suggested allowing the applicant to submit an alternative plat with the zoning that already existed so that there could be informed discussion instead of speculation, opining that there was no evidence that there could be 1,200 homes.

Commr. Campione pointed out that under the LDR, if a developer had 50 units or less, it was not a PUD, as it was a straight zoning, and that the same requirements did not exist, such as the open space requirements and other requirements. She opined that it was more practical to work with the landowner and obtain positive improvements and a positive end product; furthermore, she opined that the piecemeal development would happen, as it had in south Lake County, and that this was an opportunity to have something nicer.

Commr. Sabatini indicated his understanding that under the rule where they would get expanded use of the land, they would have to put in at least 24 projects, which was 50 homes per submittal, and opined that this would result in 24 independent projects that the BCC could individually scrutinize.

Commr. Campione opined that they could just start selling parcels off to production builders.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the Board could effectively scrutinize submittals from those developers over a long period of time to slow the engine of growth, which he opined was destroying the fabric of the county, and obtain a lower house count.

Commr. Campione pointed out that those houses would be on septic tanks because central sewer would not be brought to those projects, which was what they had currently.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that developments with 50 units or less would not come before the Board.

Ms. Marsh explained that there was a provision in the code that required any subdivision 50 units or more to rezone to a PUD, and that since those parcels were Agriculture, they would still have to rezone to obtain a unit per acre allowed under the FLU.

Commr. Campione commented that it was not all zoned Agriculture.

Commr. Sabatini inquired what percentage of the land was Agriculture.

Commr. Campione pointed out that it was in the packet, and asked Mr. Fitzgerald what the buffer was on CR 452, noting that there would be future LDR changes enhancing the buffers off of roadways.

Mr. Fitzgerald related that the minimum buffer would be 10 feet in width, and that there were options that could be proposed to have larger buffers as well as walls in the subdivision.

Commr. Campione opined that the buffer was important to discuss, and that the applicant may want to discuss their view on that.

Mr. Huels stated that he was comfortable with adding a condition to the PUD requiring a minimum buffer of 25 feet along CR 452.

Commr. Campione questioned if that enhanced the vegetative material requirement for the buffer itself, including the amount of plant material planted in the buffer, which was an LDR change that the County had been discussing, and opined that even though it had not been changed yet, it needed to be.

Mr. Huels replied that there would be Florida Native landscaping throughout the development, and that they could add that condition.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried by a vote of 3-2, the Board approved the following itmes: Tab 1, Rezoning Case #PZ2023-235, Lake Yale PUD (FLUM); Tab 2, Rezoning Case #PZ2023-236, Lake Yale PUD (RZ); the Development Agreement and Addendum with May and Whitaker Family Partnership LTD, Quality By Design Inc., and James M. Watson related to the improvements required for the construction of the Lake Yale PUD Project; and adding a condition to the PUD requiring a minimum buffer along CR 452 of 25 feet with enhanced vegetative materials.

Commr. Sabatini and Commr. Smith voted no.

SCHOFIELD ROAD PUD (RZ)

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that Tab 3, rezoning case #RZ-17-21-4, Schofield Road PUD, was to rezone approximately 47.71 acres from Agriculture to PUD to facilitate a residential subdivision and to amend and restate Ordinance 2023-74, noting that the Planning and Zoning Board had recommended approval of this item. He stated that the location was south Schofield Road and west of Cook Road in the City of Clermont area, and that the rezoning sought to amend the current master plan of approved PUD Ordinance 2023-74 to add a parcel to the PUD. He commented that the subject parcel was a Neighborhood FLU category pursuant to the 2030 Comp Plan and was located within the Wellness Way boundary area, and said that the applicant was also requesting to add a new front-loaded lot style, which was a 50-foot by 70-foot width; additionally, the applicant was proposing that the wildlife corridor provision in the original ordinance be reevaluated. He displayed the current FLU map, the current and proposed zoning maps, and the conceptual plan, and noted that most of the property was proposed to be green space and a stormwater pond with some development inside that area. He displayed a map of the scale of the project showing Wellness Way and a map of the land uses inside of Wellness Way, and said that it gave an idea of the relatively small scale compared to the Wellness Way vision as a whole. He showed a conceptual plan of what Wellness Way could potentially become, including State Road (SR) 516 and the Schofield Road PUD north of it, and pointed out that south of SR 516 was the wildlife corridor that was part of the proposal and would be dedicated to Lake County prior to any plats that were approved, noting that the applicant was requesting some relief on that and asking that the wildlife corridor be dedicated to Lake County after platting Phase 1 of Lakehaven Estates, which was approximately 253 lots, and Phase 1 of Del Webb Lakehaven, which was 212 lots. He displayed a comparison of the existing PUD and the proposed PUD, and commented that they were not proposing that the maximum number of units be increased. He related that the original PUD had 1,488 dwelling units, and that they were still maintaining that limit, noting that the increase of 47 acres provided them the opportunity to increase their total base density units to 1,233; additionally, they would be receiving an 87 dwelling unit bonus based on right of way infrastructure improvements. He stated that a summary included the following: adding 47.71 a cres to the current PUD; rezoning the subject property from Agriculture to PUD; the addition of the new lot type; the addition of new acreage that increased the non-residential square footage in the PUD; and the ability for the final plats to be approved prior to the conveyance of the wildlife corridor to Lake County. He relayed that he wanted to give some idea of the scale of the plats, and he showed a Schofield Road PUD conceptual plan view of the two subdivision plats that would be approved prior to the wildlife corridor being conveyed to Lake County.

Commr. Morris asked if that was normal.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that this was a specific provision in the 2023 ordinance, and that Lake County would receive a wildlife corridor conveyance property as part of the original approval. He explained that the conveyance of the property was still under review by County

staff, which was keeping the developer from moving forward with the approved development rights.

Commr. Morris questioned how long it would take to review it.

Ms. Marsh commented that they were getting a survey and an environmental review, and that they expected to have this done soon, as she did not expect there to be any issues with it. She recommended that the Board make this change and allow the developer to file their first plats, noting that they would not be able to file any additional plats until the County took title to the property.

Commr. Morris opined that the County did not want this property, and that it should go to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC).

Ms. Barker remarked that the County was in discussions about who should take ownership of those parcels after the conveyance has been made as well as the long-term maintenance.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that either FWC or the Florida State Park system would take it, noting that there was a Florida State Park across U.S. Highway 27. He also clarified that this was moving density around and was not an overall cap of Wellness Way.

Mr. Fitzgerald elaborated that this was just a small piece of Wellness Way, and that the developer was voluntarily capping their own maximum capacity. He commented that the property being added to the PUD was originally dedicated as having 65 units of development rights, and that even though they were adding this to their base density, they were not adding any bonus density that they could potentially obtain with any type of improvement.

Commr. Smith inquired what the setbacks would be from the right of way to the front door.

Mr. Fitzgerald answered that they would be 15 feet to the house and 25 feet to the garage.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they were not asking for any more units, and that they were just changing the configuration of the lots.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that they were going to have 65-foot lots.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that some of that development encroached on some of that new area, and that in discussions with the developer, they said that they would explore the idea of doing 65-foot lots in that area; however, this was not in the ordinance.

Commr. Parks commented that in Wellness Way they cared more about the form and design than the road frontage, and that it had a form-based code.

Commr. Smith opined that the driveway length was important.

Commr. Campione agreed that there had to be some place to park their cars.

Mr. Fitzgerald reiterated that if approved on the current day, the developer would be allowed to move forward with final plats for two of the subdivisions.

Commr. Parks explained that the conveyance was there; however, the County had not finalized the acceptance because of ongoing due diligence.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that there were no additional lots being proposed.

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.

Commr. Morris said that he had met with the applicant.

Ms. Elesa Sowell, attorney for the applicant, expressed appreciation to staff for working with them on this project, and said that they were requesting a rezoning of a parcel and adding it to the Schofield Road PUD located within the Wellness Way area. She mentioned that some background on the Wellness Way area included the following: an established long-term master plan strategy that enabled smart growth with residential and nonresidential development in south Lake County to prevent piecemeal projects; the Wellness Way area plan was adopted in 2016 and was implemented into the Comp Plan; in May 2022, the County adopted the Wellness Way area plan Comp Plan amendments along with the development standards, which were currently codified in the land development code; and it included seven FLU districts, including the multiuse district, the U.S. Highway 27 district, and the neighborhood district, which was intended for lower density neighborhoods to support the commercial and employment centers in the other districts. She commented that the two projects were both neighborhood districts, and noted that the Comp Plan required PUD zoning for all development within the Wellness Way area. She related that the project included rezoning about 47 acres to be included in the Schofield Road PUD, and that it was located in Wellness Way in the Neighborhood District FLU, noting that they would be maintaining the original cap of 1,488 maximum units, which was what was originally approved in 2023. She remarked that the property met the Comp Plan requirements, that it was compliant with and implemented the Wellness Way area plan, and that rezoning this property to PUD was the path for development. She opined that the integration of this parcel into the existing PUD would further the goal of the Wellness Way area plan by ensuring there was connectivity and uniformity, and noted that by integrating this parcel into an existing site, they could agree to 60-foot lots as a condition of this PUD and still stay consistent with the land development code for Wellness Way, which contemplated a diversity of housing options, such as small single-family lots, bungalows, and townhomes. She mentioned that the County Manager had been previously authorized to move forward with the transfer of the wildlife corridor once the due diligence was completed, and that due to the PUD requirements for the wildlife corridor, the developer had provided a special warranty deed. She opined that since the County wanted to have a survey and environmental report and the developer would like to move forward with the project, this provided a good compromise.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that when the new landscape code was passed, they would adhere to it.

Ms. Sowell stated that they would, and that it was included in the PUD.

Commr. Sabatini inquired when the landscape code would come before the Board.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that it would be at the following BCC meeting.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Tab 3, Rezoning Case #PZ2025-18, Schofield Road PUD (RZ) .

REGULAR AGENDA

RESOLUTION 2026-15: NO TRUCKS ON THRILL HILL ROAD

Commr. Campione mentioned that this was a request to post "No Trucks Over 10 Tons Local Delivery Only" signs on Thrill Hill Road between CR 44A and SR 44, and that advance warning signs would be placed on CR 44A and SR 44 to notify drivers of the restriction, noting that trucks were restricted on North Thrill Hill Road by the BCC in 2019 via Resolution 2019-66. She stated that she received this request from a property owner who lived near the bottom of the hill, and opined that it was a difficult road to drive on and was very narrow. She commented that the Public Works Department patched the sides the roads as much as possible on the prior week, as the County had limited right of way on the road, and she asked for the Board's support on this item.

Commr. Smith indicated that he was in favor of this because it was not a collector road.

Commr. Campione opined that it was a special road, and that even though it would be nice to have more right of way to put traffic calming in place, this was something that the County could do.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Resolution 2026-15 to post "No Trucks Over 10 Tons Local Delivery Only" signs on Thrill Hill Road.

REPORTS

COUNTY MANAGER

SIDEWALKS ON URICK STREET

Ms. Barker commented that Ms. Marsh contacted the Public Works Department about the sidewalk issue mentioned by Pastor Padgett, and said that the sidewalks in question were on Urick Street, which had damaged sidewalks and could be dangerous for pedestrians; however, the sidewalks were within the city limits of the City of Fruitland Park and were not County sidewalks. She relayed her understanding that Ms. Marsh had reached out to the City Attorney to notify them, and noted that she would reach out the City Manager as well.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER SABATINI – DISTRICT 1

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Commr. Sabatini mentioned that it was week three of the legislative session, and requested that every County Commissioner and every City Commissioner be very vocal about some of the bills that were moving. He expressed concerns about some of the bills, and noted that they had not passed yet, as they were sitting in committee.

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

WELLNESS WAY WEBSITE

Commr. Parks stated that the website for Wellness Way was available for factual information, and he pointed out the approved concept plan that showed what would happen by requirement. He relayed his understanding that there would be a concept plan available soon on the website, and that this could be used to answer questions by constituents, noting that a large percentage of this area was open space and natural protected areas, including the wildlife corridor to the south. He also commented that SR 516 was currently under construction.

AGRICULTURE UPDATE

Commr. Parks opined that regarding agriculture, the recent freezes were the worst they had been since the 1980s, and that the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Services (UF/IFAS) and staff were trying to assess the damage.

Ms. Barker commented that there were still freezes happening, and that damages would be assessed afterwards, opining that it may take many months to understand the damages, as one could not know until the plants started growing back.

Commr. Parks mentioned that Commissioner of Agriculture Wilton Simpson, with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, had been working with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to obtain Federal assistance for this, opining that it would benefit Lake County.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Commr. Parks indicated concerns about what may happen in the legislature regarding growth management, opining that the BCC should be involved. He commented that the Florida Association of Counties (FAC) had an action plan that was available listing some of the issues, and he wondered if the County was going to explore potential scenarios of what may happen regarding the issues with property tax.

Ms. Barker mentioned that there were currently eight proposals for the property tax issue, and that even though they wanted to do a side-by-side comparison of those, they would wait to see what would get through committee.

Commr. Parks related that he had brought forward four items on the legislative action plan that were officially adopted by FAC, and expressed appreciation to Commissioner Sabatini for his support at the meetings. He opined that FAC had a good policymaking process in place, and that they were well represented. He opined that it was encouraging to get more policies through than what was on the legislative agenda for the delegation, and noted that Senators, State Representatives, committees, and staff all received a copy of it.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Commr. Smith indicated appreciation to Ms. Barker for visiting the City of Tallahassee with him in the previous week, and said that they discussed the legislative priorities, the property tax issue, and issues with a couple of bills that were coming up, opining that it was productive and

very well received. He remarked that Lake County was paying attention, actively making their voices heard, and was well represented.

QUARTERLY MEETING WITH THE CITIES

Commr. Smith expressed appreciation to the 14 Cities that attended the quarterly meeting for participating.

65-FOOT LOT FRONTAGE REQUIREMENT

Commr. Smith commented that he wanted to place a map on a future agenda, which was a conceptual plan of a neighborhood in Orange and Lake Counties, and said that he wanted to require a 65-foot lot frontage requirement for Lake County with a couple of exceptions. He said that he wanted to discuss this on a future agenda, and mentioned that this was done for the City of Tavares, opining that it did nothing to discourage development and enhanced the appearance of the neighborhoods. He relayed his understanding that Orange County had a lot size requirement, and opined that this caused a large disparity in the same neighborhood. He opined that if one wanted to be in an urban setting with smaller lots, then they could go to the cities where there were higher densities; however, he opined that if one wanted to develop in the county, then they needed to give people some room.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that Commissioner Smith wanted the Board to adopt a 65-foot width requirement unless the development was in one of the designated areas, such as a rural conservation development, and opined that even though she liked the idea of wider lots, this would have to be evaluated because of the Bert J. Harris, Jr., Private Property Rights Protection Act.

Commr. Sabatini stated that he was open minded about this, and that he would like to move forward with it.

Commr. Parks opined that even though he was open to discussion, it could not be a blanket requirement, and mentioned that there could also be traditional neighborhood developments.

Ms. Marsh remarked that she would work in conjunction with the Office of Planning and Zoning to bring some scenarios back to the Board; however, there was a bill in legislation called the Florida Starter Home Act, and that if this passed, the County would be prohibited from imposing any type of regulation that would require a minimum lot size greater that 1,200 square feet, which would do away with the 65-foot lot line ordinance in a starter home community. She mentioned that this bill also would not allow the County to require setbacks from the side, rear, or front, and noted that they would be monitoring this bill as it moved through to see what impacts it may have.

Commr. Smith opined that it should not keep the Board from moving forward with planning, and that developers could make wide lots and shorter homes. He opined that starter homes could be one or two bedrooms, and that they did not need three and four bedrooms.

COMMISSIONER MORRIS – DISTRICT 5

ISBA DISCUSSION WITH THE CITIES

Commr. Morris opined that having 14 municipalities together was nice, and that even though they County was working on JPAs with each City, the ISBA discussion was interesting,

noting that the ISBA took what their boundary was and negotiated what they should or should not develop. He commented that even though Commissioner Parks had spent much time on the JPAs, there had not been much return, and opined that it would be easier to negotiate the ISBAs.

SERVICE IN THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Commr. Morris indicated appreciation to Commissioner Sabatini for his service in the Army National Guard.

STATE OF EMERGENCY

Commr. Morris opined that even though the farmers he had spoken to had crop insurance and there was Federal help, the State needed to issue a state of emergency because of the recent freezing of the crops.

LCWA BOARD SALARY

Commr. Morris mentioned that a member of the LCWA Board had requested that he not be paid for his appointment, and opined that the BCC needed to approach each of the LCWA Board members and ask them if they would like to not be paid. He opined that they could donate their salaries to the stormwater fund.

COMMISSIONER SABATINI – DISTRICT 1

LAKE COUNTY PROPERTY APPRAISER'S BUDGET

Commr. Sabatini remarked that regarding the case against the Lake County Property Appraiser's budget, he would like to see a public presentation from the County's lobbyist on any substantial efforts that were made to persuade the State to correct this issue. He opined that this should not have happened, and said that he would like to hire a supplemental lobbyist. He opined that this would cost about $50,000, which was five percent of the funds the County would receive if the challenge was successful, and that $1 million would go back to the County, which could go towards roads. He opined that currently, the County was not going to receive this because this had not been taken up, and stated that he would like to hear what the lobbyist had to say. He opined that the State might possibly have much to do and was not hearing enough from the lobbyist about this issue, and that obtaining supplemental secondary lobbying efforts could get this issue in front of the State and inform the BCC about what was going on behind the scenes. He requested that the Board have an update by Gray Robinson P.A. in a future BCC meeting, which could be via Zoom because they were in session, and then assess if the Board needed to go a stronger route by hiring a second lobbyist, opining that it was normal for a large entity or project to have two to five lobbyists.

Commr. Morris commented that he was in favor of hearing from the County's current lobbyist, and relayed his understanding that even though there were several Counties challenging budget requests, the legislature had not heard them yet. He said that he did not know what hiring somebody else to represent the County would do, and opined that the other Counties also had their lobbyists working on it.

Commr. Sabatini mentioned that he wanted to hear this addressed by the lobbyist.

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

ISBA DISCUSSION WITH THE CITIES CONTINUED

Commr. Parks remarked that there had been progress with JPAs, and indicated his understanding that the only reason ISBAs became legislation was to allow Cities to annex parcels that were not contiguous to provide utilities; however, the consequences were very different from JPAs.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that JPAs were for land use planning, and that ISBAs were more for services, opining that this was the reason why Cities wanted to annex.

Commr. Morris related that some of the City Managers he had spoken to felt that the County was possibly encroaching on their ability to make decisions regarding land planning.

Commr. Parks explained that a JPA could be customized, and that the City would not agree to do it if the County did not agree to do it.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that there was still work to do on the JPA with the City of Groveland, and opined that even though the County was spending much effort and staff time to do this, there were not many that had been done.

Commr. Parks opined that much of the language in the ISBA could be in a JPA, which was a statutory tool to prevent urban sprawl.

Commr. Morris questioned how the County could complete them.

Commr. Campione pointed out that Mr. Al Minner, Leesburg City Manager, offered to do away with the ISBA, and opined that there had been progress even though it was taking much time. She opined that there was a way to approach this in light of the feedback received, and that the Cities were willing to look at the County's Rural designated areas, potentially honor that designation, and create a boundary around them. She opined that staff could be relied on to present a simplified version of a JPA or an ISBA.

Commr. Parks stated that he preferred to call it a JPA because it was in Florida Statute for urban sprawl.

Commr. Campione pointed out that an ISBA was also in Florida Statute, and opined that there were large gains from the joint meeting. She opined that there could be a countywide JPA where the County and the Cities all agreed on the boundaries, and that it could just address the urban/rural boundary while the individual JPAs could include the other items that each City was willing to agree to; additionally, she opined that the countywide JPA could include that the Cities would consider the possibility of a TDR system. She opined that the County could still do a TDR system, and that if the Cities were willing to participate under the County's framework, then this could be started.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

LITERACY WEEK

Commr. Campione related that she had the opportunity to read to students at Sorrento Elementary and Seminole Springs Elementary, noting that at Seminole Springs Elementary, they also had a Liberty Tree ceremony organized by their historical society. She opined that Ms. Terri

Soos, Principal of Seminole Springs Elementary, did an amazing job, and said that they all read the same book to the students, which was based on patriotism and the country's founding 250 years prior; additionally, they had music and a choir that sang patriotic songs.

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Commr. Campione opined that regarding the legislation, the Board needed to make an official stand and send a letter to each member of the delegation, and that it should include anything that was degrading home rule or taking away land use decision making. She opined that the Board should ask the lobbyist to watch for any items from bills that had died that were placed in other bills, and that this would shift the burden to them. She expressed appreciation to those who had done one-on-one meetings and to Ms. Barker for making the trip.

Commr. Sabatini remarked that he was in favor of that idea, opining that this was important.

STATE OF EMERGENCY

Commr. Campione stated that her heart went out to the farmers, and hoped that Governor Ron DeSantis would declare a state of emergency so they could obtain the assistance they needed to get through this time and to replant.

Commr. Sabatini wondered if staff could send a letter from the Board to Governor Ron DeSantis on this issue.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that the farmers were covering it.

Commr. Smith commented that UF/IFAS was also contributing.

Commr. Campione opined that the Board could reinforce whatever UF/IFAS was doing.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

NATIONAL DAYS

Commr. Smith said that it was National "The Day the Music Died" Day and National Carrot Cake Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:59 p.m.

_____

LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____

GARY J COONEY, CLERK