A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

FEBRUARY 10, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, February 10, 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; Gary J. Cooney, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller; Mary Burns, Accounting Director; and Stephanie Cash, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Commr. Campione welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Reverend Kristina Spaude, from Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Lake County, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, said that Tab 17 had been added as an addendum to the agenda since it was first published, and she asked that it be moved to the regular agenda. She added that there was a request from Commissioner Sabatini to add an emergency item to the current agenda, noting that she would need a vote to approve this. She specified that the item would be regarding Senate Bill (SB) 686 and companion House Bill (HB) 691, which addressed agricultural enclaves. She commented that on the current day, there would be a Senate Judiciary Committee vote, and that staff was looking for direction from the Board on whether the lobbyist could move forward with opposing the bill.

EMERGENCY AGENDA ITEM

Commr. Sabatini relayed his understanding that GrayRobinson, the County's lobbyists, focused mostly on their appropriations projects, and that the Board could indicate which policies they would like GrayRobinson to oppose or support, though they were not that specific about it. He discussed the lobbyist disclosure for a bill, and opined that the Florida Association of Counties (FAC) did a good job; however, he opined that it should be supplemented by the funding that the County was expending to lobby in accordance with this. He suggested to see if there was consensus to instruct their lobbyist to enter a card in opposition to SB 686 for modifications. He explained that one part of the bill changed the public hearing process for agricultural enclaves, and that the other part decreased the percentage of land that agricultural land must border to be considered an agricultural enclave, noting that it was currently 75 percent and that this bill would lower it to 50 percent under some circumstances. He opined that this created a domino effect where basically any farm in the state which had 50 percent borders of residential land would automatically receive the same entitlements; therefore, he opined that the state was creating a large incentive for people to sell and that it would likely take 20 years to eliminate the majority of farms in the state. He opined that the Board should instruct GrayRobinson to submit a card, indicating

his understanding that Miami-Dade, Osceola and Columbia Counties had also done this, to amend this bill in a way that removes the percentage.

Commr. Campione asked if they had any farms in Lake County which this threshold would apply to.

Ms. Marsh replied that they looked at it for one specific property, though they had not done an analysis to see what other agricultural land this might impact in the county.

Commr. Campione mentioned the Rural and Family Lands Program, and she questioned why the focus would not be on farms surrounded by urban uses to purchase development rights, noting that these farms were experiencing pressure.

Commr. Parks said that the program would purchase the development rights, but it was possibly only 50 percent of the market value, noting that there was a ranking system for how much funding they received; therefore, development interest could make it so enticing with money that it bypassed this.

Commr. Campione opined that this should be a consideration for how they funded these programs, and that if they were trying to prevent sprawl and promote farming, then it seemed like they should put State funding where their language was. She also expressed concerns for saying that they were pro-farming but being anti-farmer. She opined that they were relegating them to a lower value than if they had the land uses immediately surrounding them.

Commr. Sabatini opined that they were being relegated to their current value.

Commr. Campione opined that from a development pattern standpoint in these situations where they were surrounded by 75 percent urban, under ordinary circumstances they could likely receive development approvals or higher densities. She opined that they had to be careful with the rhetoric of "save our farms" and not losing sight of the fact that they could possibly be hurting farmers. She said that she was in favor of opposing this with the understanding that they would propose additional language.

Commr. Sabatini noted that this specific bill granted automatic legal rights without a public hearing.

Commr. Campione opined that if they were going to help in these situations, they should either have programs to buy out development rights, or increase what the State was willing to pay so that the farmer could potentially keep farming but cash out.

Commr. Sabatini clarified that the bill was just a preemption bill and that it regarded any farm of less than 700 acres which had 50 percent boundaries of urban areas, and opined that the Board could oppose this. He opined that Commissioner Campione's points were valid on agriculture and that they needed to possibly think about other items that their lobbyists could address at a more specific level. He also relayed that this was an emergency item because it was the second committee stop and that they had one more before the floor.

Commr. Campione asked if the language was urban boundary.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, clarified that it was urban service district, which was defined in Florida Statutes.

Commr. Parks stated that it essentially removed the County's ability to make decisions, and he opined that citizens deserved a public process.

Commr. Campione opined that it could possibly give the County criteria regarding when it would be appropriate to upzone property like this as opposed to removing the rights from local government.

Commr. Smith said that this was the first time he heard about this.

Commr. Sabatini relayed that this had started on the previous Saturday when he read the SB 686 analysis, noting that this was year two of the bill and that it had been killed in the previous year on the Senate floor.

Commr. Smith asked why this would be an emergency discussion instead of letting the Board read the new language in the bill to make an informed decision on whether to move forward with this.

Commr. Campione inquired if there was minimum acreage.

Commr. Sabatini said that there was currently an urban enclave law and that if one had a farm which had 75 percent residential urban boundaries, it was automatically granted the same thing. He opined that they were now balancing the rights too much on the side of the property owner and that if this bill passed, any farm which was 700 acres or less and had 50 percent borders with urban or residential areas would automatically receive the same density with no public hearing. He mentioned that FAC and most people were opposing it, and that it was changing the scales between development rights and local control too far in most people's opinions on the side of real estate and development.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that there would be no public discussion, noting that the County had discussion on anything that was 50 units or more.

Commr. Campione related that it was being preempted.

Ms. Marsh explained that the first part of the bill created a public hearing process which said that the owner of a parcel of land may apply to the governing body for certification of the parcel as an agricultural enclave. She elaborated that the County then had to develop a report within 30 days which would go to the local governing body for a public hearing, at which point the local government could approve or deny. She said that if they denied the certification of an agricultural enclave, then the property owner had the ability to appeal this to the circuit court; furthermore, if the County approved it, then they would be entitled to go directly to the development process. She commented that part two was amending the definition of an agricultural enclave, which already existed in Florida Statutes. She said that they were adding some additional criteria where it could qualify as an agricultural enclave if it did not exceed 700 acres and was surrounded on at least 50 percent of the perimeter by a parcel or parcels that the local government had designated on their future land use (FLU) map to be developed for industrial, commercial or residential purposes, and if the parcels were surrounded on at least 50 percent of their perimeter by a parcel within an urban service district. She commented that there were some other criteria being added, and that the bill was broadening the definition of agricultural enclave and setting up the public hearing process. She clarified that the question about the public hearing process was

that it said a property owner may apply, rather than saying that they had to apply to receive the agricultural enclave. She was unsure if the intent was to make them do this process, or if it was an additional certification for the property so that they could move forward with development.

Commr. Smith asked if it preempted the County's rule that if one had 50 homes or more, it had to go through a planned unit development (PUD).

Ms. Marsh replied that if the application was approved, the owner of the parcel certified as an agricultural enclave may submit development plans for single family residential, which was consistent with land use requirements or FLU designations.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the County could keep its Rural Transition and Agriculture zoning, though they had to allow one to put houses there.

Ms. Marsh confirmed this and added that local government would not agree to make them go through a process longer than 180 days.

Commr. Smith inquired if they still had to follow the County's Land Development Regulations (LDR).

Ms. Marsh read that "development for which plans are submitted under this paragraph must be treated as a conforming use."

Commr. Campione asked if it was increased to an urban land use once they were determined to be an agricultural enclave.

Ms. Marsh reiterated that if the application was approved, the owner may submit development plans for single family residential housing consistent with the land use requirements or FLU designations of one or more adjacent parcels or an adjacent development. She elaborated that a local government may not enact or enforce a law or regulation which was more burdensome than for other types of applications for comparable uses or densities; rather, they would treat the agricultural enclave that was adjacent to an urban service district as if such enclave was within the urban service district.

Commr. Smith asked what Commissioner Sabatini was asking the Board to do.

Commr. Sabatini replied that it was to direct their lobbyists to submit a card to eliminate the 50 percent language and protect the current law on agricultural enclaves.

Commr. Smith asked if the enclave could be any boundary instead of a surrounding boundary.

Ms. Marsh stated that there was no definition for how they calculated the 50 percent.

Commr. Morris inquired how this interacted with SB 180 and if this contradicted it.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that SB 180 said that they could not do anything locally that was more restrictive, and that this bill was telling the County what they had to do if they received one of these applications for an agricultural enclave.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that there would be a nominal hearing for an enclave.

Ms. Marsh stated that the only hearing was for the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to determine whether it qualified as an agricultural enclave, and that if they certified it as qualifying, then the applicant would come in and file their site plans and plats, etc., with no further

public hearing. She relayed that if the BCC said that it was not an agricultural enclave, then the applicant had the ability to appeal it to the circuit court.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the BCC would be asking to keep the 75 percent designation.

Ms. Marsh responded that it was to keep the current definition of an enclave and not expand it.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to add an Emergency Agenda Item to the agenda regarding Senate Bill (SB) 686 and companion House Bill (HB) 691, which addressed agricultural enclaves.

Commr. Campione asked if they could include some language regarding how the Board would like them to consider this.

Commr. Smith opined that they should keep it the way it was, expressing concerns for wordsmithing at the current time. He said that he was agreeable with Ms. Marsh and Commissioner Sabatini saying that they were trying to keep what they currently had.

Commr. Campione commented that at another time, they could possibly discuss the potential of suggesting a better way to buy out farms or development rights on farms, including more funding for that program and more emphasis on land under threat of urban expansion.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to direct their lobbyist to put in a lobbyist card to seek to amend this bill to preserve the current agricultural enclave laws as opposed to the changes included in the bill.

MINUTES APPROVAL

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the minutes for the BCC meeting of December 16, 2025 (Regular Meeting) as presented.

CITIZEN QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD

Commr. Campione remarked that they allowed a three minute time period and that a timer would sound, and that someone online through Zoom could press *9 to virtually raise their hand.

Mr. Carlos Solis, a resident of Lake County, indicated that he was a political refugee from Cuba and that he had served on the South Lake Hospital Board for 13 years, as well as a planning and zoning commission. He recalled that in 2012 he and his wife had been named Citizens of the Year and received the Gem of the Hills Award twice. He requested the Board's support for getting his autobiography into local libraries and high schools in Lake County.

Commr. Campione relayed that the Board would love to help in this endeavor.

Commr. Parks said that Mr. Solis' emotion and passion for the country was real, and opined that this was a great story. He asked if Mr. Solis tried getting through to the library system.

Mr. Solis replied that he made some calls and was told that they could not accept the book since he was a self-publisher.

Commr. Parks opined that it was a great story and that Mr. Solis was a great Lake County resident; therefore, he opined that it was important to be in the library system.

Commr. Campione stated that the Board did not have the authority to add it to the library system.

Ms. Marsh clarified that they had a process for collection review, and that the Board could recommend that it be vetted through that process.

Commr. Parks relayed that he could possibly write something recommending approval of this to expedite the process.

Commr. Smith thanked Mr. Solis for this book.

Commr. Campione said that the Board could also include a letter to go along with this, noting that they could read the book and recommend the letter at the next BCC meeting.

Commr. Morris requested to be sent the process that they went through for this.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to recommend that the book be accepted and to begin the process.

Mr. Joe Fumasi, a resident of Jumping Jack Way, said that he was present to address the community development district (CDD)/municipal services benefit taxing unit (MSTU) tax and other items created in Wellness Way. He relayed his understanding that the rules were adjusted in May 2022, which benefited the developers, and that workforce housing was lowered from 1.05 to 1.25, which reduced the need for commercial space. He indicated his understanding that more houses were advocated for, and said that he found a report completed in May 2022 for a development in another county from Parks Consulting Services. He asked if this was Commissioner Parks' service which did this, and relayed his understanding that Lennar Homes owned this company. He indicated his understanding that Lennar Homes benefited from the changes, and that the MSTU funds were given to the Wellness Ridge CDD, which was owned by Lennar Homes. He opined that the developer did not have to pay any costs toward the operation and maintenance because they were counting these revenues as a new revenue stream. He asked if the plan was to help benefit the taxpayers or the developer.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that Mr. Fumasi owned three properties there which were bought in 2024, and he asked if Mr. Fumasi knew that it had a CDD and MSTU when he bought them. He also opined that the CDD and MSTU benefited everyone.

Mr. Fumasi expressed concerns for benefits being set up for developers, and he opined that they were not really informed about the CDD and the MSTU.

Commr. Parks clarified that there had never been a reduction or an attempt to change land uses or the plan for more houses and less commercial. He said that they could see if someone was double paying, and that they were not trying to make developers pay less and put it more on the taxpayers.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that when the MSTU began, the costs shifted to developer-only at the beginning, since the developer owned everything, to the homeowners as they bought homes. She added that the developer contribution decreased as more people came online.

Commr. Parks confirmed that broadly, with more people and businesses being there, the cost would be distributed over that larger number; therefore, everything would be reduced.

Commr. Campione inquired if the developer contribution decreased over time to the extent that the developer did not own inventory anymore.

Ms. Barker explained that the MSTU was charged to the property owner, and that at the time of a new development where the property owner was a developer at that point, they would be paying the MSTU. She elaborated that as the individual lots were sold, the new property owners would be responsible for paying the MSTU and it would come off the developer's overall tax bill.

Commr. Parks clarified that he did not work for Lennar Homes or homebuilders.

Commr. Smith opined that Commissioner Parks was doing this for the best of all of Lake County, and he indicated his understanding that the MSTU was to have people who utilized the road within the district pay for the road, noting that the County owned the road. He then asked if the MSTU funding came back to the County to repair the road, or if it was the onus of the homeowner's association (HOA) to ensure the repairs.

Ms. Marsh stated that the MSTU was put in place for enhanced maintenance and facilities on the County-maintained collector roads, and that the County performed this; furthermore, it had nothing to do with the development.

Mr. Allen Foote, a resident of the City of Leesburg, recalled that he had previously approached the BCC regarding the neglected Evergreen Cemetery, and relayed his understanding that it came down to one owner whose last known address was in Cancun; furthermore, many letters had been sent, though no one responded. He asked that since everything was being neglected, was there something legal that his organization could do. He relayed that the committee that he belonged to was made up of people who had grown up in the City of Leesburg and Lake County with relatives who had been there for many years, and that the committee had taken it upon itself to do a cleanup. He remarked that he had discovered 10 more graves, opining that it was important to the community that this was maintained. He commented that if they did some sort of legal takeover, they would still have to look at maintaining it for the community, and he questioned where they stood with regard to contacting the owner.

Ms. Marsh said that there was another resident in Lake County who had a similar issue with a historic cemetery in East Lake, and that she had created a nonprofit and was able to obtain grants from the State to help take care of that cemetery. She indicated that this individual was willing to share information with Mr. Foote's group, and that ownership of Evergreen Cemetery was split between three entities. She specified that ownership was 50 percent BS Properties, 25 percent Lily Cordonas Trustee, and 25 percent Carter Properties. She elaborated that Carter Properties and BS Properties were dissolved in September 2025, and relayed her understanding that the individual who owned both of these companies resided in Mexico with attempts to contact them being unsuccessful. She was unsure of any information about Lily Cordonas Trustee, and said that there were still active burials taking place at Evergreen Cemetery. She added that there was a church who assisted people looking to bury relatives there; therefore, someone had records, though the County did not have access to that information. She mentioned that State law said that the County could enter an abandoned cemetery and do onetime maintenance; however, she did not think that onetime maintenance would solve the issue, opining that it would be a question of if the

County wanted to assume maintenance in perpetuity. She stated that the County already had seven inactive cemeteries that they maintained, and that a substantial amount of funding was spent on maintaining them. She recommended that she connect this group with Ms. Katherine de Jongh and let her share information with them to see if there was a path forward for them to create a nonprofit and possibly receive some grants to potentially maintain the cemetery.

Commr. Sabatini inquired if there were any code enforcement liens against this, and if there was anything that seemed to not be in compliance.

Ms. Barker replied that a code enforcement hearing was planned for April 2026.

Commr. Smith agreed with going with a nonprofit first, noting that the County could not go onto someone else's property and do what they wanted.

Mr. Foote relayed his understanding that the County owned a small section on that cemetery property.

Ms. Marsh confirmed that the County owned a one acre corner of that property, though the majority of the property was privately owned.

Mr. Glen Guzman, Director for the Office of Code Enforcement, said that because the County had a piece, they had been able to access and go further into the property, noting that this provided them the authority to do so. He said that they attempted to locate individuals but were unsuccessful, and that they would likely post the property as Florida Statutes required and continue their code enforcement case, noting that the case was for non-maintenance and that they were on track for an April 2026 hearing.

Commr. Campione asked what it would cost to attempt to do a quiet title.

Ms. Marsh remarked that the County had no title to this, and that they would have to review the statute on cemeteries to see if it would give them the right to try to obtain title for it. She added that there were no tax deeds and that it was tax exempt property.

Commr. Campione opined that if they could at least get a lien which was not paid, then they could potentially foreclose and receive ownership.

Ms. Marsh confirmed this, though noted that there were active burials taking place on this property and that the County had no records for this; therefore, they did not know who owned which gravesites there, who was using it, and where the funding was going to. She said that this could be determined if they took title.

Commr. Campione relayed that if the County secured title and immediately transferred it to the residents' nonprofit, then it would transfer the liability to them address what was occurring on the property.

Ms. Marsh said that this was a possibility.

Commr. Morris opined that if one wanted to know where the money went, they could ask the funeral home where the money was sent when someone was buried. He elaborated that from there, they could start sending notices to that address.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that money was not being sent somewhere and that individuals were using plots that family members had there.

Commr. Parks relayed that he was going to bring the cemetery issue up during an upcoming workshop, noting that many people complained because they could not find a place to utilize. He opined that it was not in the County's best interest to manage cemeteries across the county, and that it could possibly be in their interest to get nonprofits set up with a potential revenue source with selling plots to keep that particular cemetery going.

Commr. Campione inquired if the one acre that the County owned was vacant.

Ms. Marsh relayed her understanding that there were graves on the one acre that they maintained, and that there was not capacity for more usage.

Commr. Campione asked how far back the tombstones and markers went.

Mr. Foote indicated his understanding that it started in 1937 and that people born in the 1800s were there. He opined that it had historical value, and said that his organization was planning a second cleanup for the perimeter. He stated that he had spoken to Ms. de Jongh and had that information, and he expressed interested in continuing to work on it.

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT AND COMPTROLLER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller's Consent Agenda, Items 1 through 6, as follows:

List of Warrants

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

Lakehaven CDD Public Facilities Report

Notice is hereby provided of having received a copy of Lakehaven Community Development District's Public Facilities Report dated November 26, 2025, pursuant to Section 189.008, Florida Statutes.

Lands Available List

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

City of Groveland's CRA Audited Financial Statements for FY 2023-2024

Notice is hereby provided of having received the City of Groveland's CRA Audited Financial Statements for FY 2023-2024.

City of Umatilla Ordinance

Notice is hereby provided of having received Ordinance 2025-J from the City of Umatilla.

City of Mount Dora Annexation Ordinance

Notice is hereby provided of having received Annexation Ordinance 2025-21 from the City of Mount Dora as required by Chapter 171.044(3) Florida Statutes with the accompanying map.

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONSENT AGENDA

Commr. Campione said that there was a comment card for Tab 4.

Commr. Smith asked to pull Tab 3.

Commr. Morris asked that for Tab 5, was Commissioner Smith comfortable with the County Manager having the ability to issue the $150,000 sponsorship for THE Spring Games and it not coming to the Board.

Commr. Smith relayed that he was comfortable with this, as well as for 2027.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Consent Agenda, Tabs 5 through 7, pulling Tabs 3 and 4 to the regular agenda, as follows:

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Tourism

Recommend approval:

1. To provide Tourist Development Tax funding for host fees and related event expenses for the 2026 The Spring Games, Event, which runs from February 13 through March 28, 2026; and

2. To authorize the Chairman to execute the Agreement with The Spring Games; and

3. To delegate authority to the County Manager to approve a renewal for 2027 for up to the same funding amount for that year, if requested by The Spring Games and recommended by the Tourist Development Council.

The fiscal impact is not to exceed $150,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. If the 2027 renewal is approved as set forth in the Agreement, then the fiscal impact would not exceed $150,000 (expenditure) for that year. Commission District 2 and 5.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Public Works

Recommend approval to award the North Lake Trail - East Collins Street to Beach Street construction project (Contract 26-702) to Bulldog Sitework, LLC for $1,083,525.33.

The fiscal impact is $1,083,525.33 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 4.

Recommend approval:

1. Of a Task Order with Halff Associates, Inc to design intersection improvements at Jalarmy Road and Lake Minneola Shores as part of Continuing Contract 24-432C; and

2. To authorize the Office of Procurement Services to execute all supporting documentation.

The fiscal impact is $135,028 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 1 and 2.

TAB 3: DECLARE ITEMS AS SURPLUS

Commr. Smith stated that this was when they had items from the Office of Procurement Services which were recommended to be done away with, and that the spreadsheet he received included the item description, which department it was under, the date it was purchased, and the purchase price. He added that under comments, it said “end of life due to cost of repairs,” noting that he would like to see the cost of repairs on the spreadsheet.

Ms. Barker commented that staff could add a column with the cost of repairs.

Commr. Smith requested for it to specify why it was considered end of life and too costly to keep.

Ms. Barker remarked that it could be anticipated costs to repair it, and that upcoming costs were exceeding the value of the asset; additionally, it could be that past repairs over the last several months exceeded the value of the asset, noting that staff could identify this in the spreadsheet.

Commr. Morris inquired if a column could be added for what would be received, or if they gave the item away.

Ms. Barker stated that this was just to remove it off the asset list, and then it would possibly go to auction; therefore, staff did not know what they would receive. She added that sometimes items were donated to other governmental entities, that they sometimes went to auction, and that obsolete technology may be disposed of.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to have the Office of Procurement Services add a column to dictate the repair cost going forward.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to declare the items listed on the attached inventory as surplus, authorize their removal from the County's official fixed asset records, and authorize the Office of Procurement Services Director to execute all necessary documentation.

TAB 4: HOTEL INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM AWARD

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Cindy Newton, a resident of Commission District 4, said that she wanted this item to be presented because it was a large loss of $824,269 of ad valorem taxes. She relayed her understanding that this item was in the works long before this incentive was passed, indicating her understanding that these items would be discussed, including whether transportation fees would be waived.

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

Commr. Parks said that the applicant had not submitted any development applications.

Commr. Campione relayed that this was just a request to see if they would be able to receive the incentive if they moved forward.

Ms. Meg Brew, Director for the Office of Economic Development, stated that this was the first application received for the approved hotel incentive program. She explained that the Board approved the hotel incentive program in the previous fall, and that the intention of the program was to encourage the development of high quality hotels by incentivizing the inclusion of amenities that had been identified as desirable to their target markets. She clarified that the program was less about business attraction than influencing hoteliers to incorporate a greater quantity and quality of amenities than the current market alone may have demanded. She hoped that this program would not only improve the quality of visitor experience in Lake County, but also have a positive economic impact on the community. She opined that people would spend locally when they stayed locally, and that when high quality hotels were located in their community, the County was able to capture Tourist Development Taxes (TDT) that would otherwise be generated across county lines. She mentioned that this program required applicants to make a minimum $20 million investment in the construction or redevelopment of their site, and that grant payments were calculated based on a percentage of new property tax revenue, taking into consideration the number and type of amenities provided. She remarked that grants were only paid after annual compliance was verified, and that a clawback clause was included for issues related to underperformance or non-performance. She related that this program was available for

up to five hotels within 10 years, and that the current application was the first of five that the Board may hear. She said that the application exceeded the program requirement for capital investment and achieved greater than 16 points on the amenities table, which meant that their award would start at 75 percent of the new ad valorem taxes generated for Lake County and then decrease annually over a five year period. She added that the total estimated fiscal impact was $824,269 over a five-year period, and that the project was projected to generate $1.5 million in new ad valorem taxes. She also indicated that the County would no longer be paying after the five year grant period was over, and that the project was estimated to generate $300,000 in ad valorem taxes per year.

Mr. Spencer Schar, representing the applicant, said that the proposed hotel was The Mansion at Bella Collina, and that the property was located directly outside the bounds of the community. He relayed that they were looking to develop about four acres, and that it was in the unincorporated area near the Town of Montverde. He stated that the hotel would include the following: hotel restaurant; lobby bar; day spa; pool and pool bar; room service; about 100 rooms with 30 being suites; a 4,200 square foot ballroom; a 3,000 square foot event lawn; and 2,400 square feet of additional meeting and event space. He said that they were looking to employ about 225 total people on top of their current 200 employees at The Club at Bella Collina. He relayed information about his family, noting that they had owned the Bella Collina property for 14 years. He clarified that they were not looking to bring in a flagship corporation to manage this property, and that it would be managed by The Club at Bella Collina, though it would not be a membership focused property. He said that it would be open to the public, and that they were looking to invest about $75 million with no outside investors; furthermore, it would be owned and operated by his family and the organization that they were currently leading within Bella Collina. He mentioned that they were currently in the design phase and were looking to start construction in fall 2026 with an opening in late 2028. He opined that there was a lack of local access to luxury amenities and event space, noting that this hotel would allow for around 10,000 square feet of event space usable by all residents of Lake County. He added that there would be access to smaller meeting space and boardrooms for businesses, and opined that there was a lack of hotel room supply, noting that their plan was to supply more for the demand. He opined that there were current positive conditions for Lake County, including the following: population growth within the county which would be sufficient enough to grant the need for more supply for hotel and luxury amenities; hospitality demand from those who lived there; and the incentivization of high quality projects with desired amenities.

Commr. Campione relayed that there was not only long term capital investment, and that after this incentive was used, the property would remain and be a valuable asset to the applicant and the tax roll. She added that there would be hotel taxes paid, which were a large part of the County's focus on promoting Lake County, sports tourism, etc. She also mentioned sales tax and the spending that would occur as a result of this, opining that it seemed like a win-win.

Commr. Smith asked if Ms. Brew felt that this development made enhancements due to this incentive.

Ms. Brew replied that this was one of the questions they asked on the application, and confirmed that it had a large sway on their decision.

Commr. Smith opined that this incentive was doing what it was supposed to do and was enhancing the properties which were going to go in anyway.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Sabatini and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved an Economic Development Hotel Incentive Grant Program award for Hotel Siena Holdings LLC pursuant to Section 7-5, Lake County Code, after finalization of an agreement, and for the Chairman to execute the Agreement upon review by the County Attorney's Office.

DISCUSSION ON PROPERTY APPRAISER'S FISCAL YEAR 2026 BUDGET

Commr. Campione relayed that Mr. Chris Carmody, with GrayRobinson, was on Zoom to discuss Tab 11, and she requested to address this item at the current time. She recalled at that the previous BCC meeting they discussed that they were hoping to make progress on this appeal, noting that they were in a holding pattern and wanted to find out Mr. Carmody's recommendations for the County to be successful in this challenge.

Commr. Sabatini said that there was $1 million on the line, and opined that this was a large priority for the County; additionally, he opined that the precedent was dangerous, and that they needed to ensure that when these types of budget requests were asked for, they could quash them, and that public officials on the Cabinet level would be put on notice that this was wrong. He said that he wanted to track what efforts were made and where there were obstacles to possibly come up with an alternative plan to amplify their efforts.

Mr. Carmody stated that by talking to individuals in the Florida Office of Policy and Budget, there were five appeals from a Constitutional Officer with three being Sheriffs, noting that they had a separate process, and two being Property Appraisers, including Lake County. He mentioned that the process for Property Appraisers was less deadline intensive, though none of the Sheriff appeals had moved forward either. He stated that there was a staff recommendation which ultimately led to Office of Policy and Budget Chief making a recommendation on what to do with this appeal, and then it would ultimately go to the Administration Commission, which was the Florida Governor and the Cabinet members. He remarked that there was no timeline for when they would do this, and that there would be a February 24, 2026 Cabinet meeting; additionally, he had confirmed that if this item would be at that meeting, then they would have already reached out to Lake County and individuals on the other side, noting that he would not expect it to be on February 24, 2026. He stated that the upcoming Cabinet meetings beyond this would be on June 9, September 15 and November 17, 2026.

Commr. Sabatini expressed concerns for this, opining that the Board had to make an emergency motion to do something because the funding could possibly be gone by June 2026. He opined that the County should go public, do an official letter, possibly hire additional hands to help Mr. Carmody, and that the Board needed to be calling the Governor's Office and their staff.

Mr. Carmody said that it had taken this long in some previous years for them to accomplish an item, and he said that if and when the item was ready, there would be a presentation made to

the aides before the meeting so that they could confer with their report-tos and help build consensus before it reached the Administration Commission. He elaborated that this would effectively be the new budget, and that they would either uphold, amend, or reject the previous budget and come up with a new one. He mentioned that they had stayed in touch about every other week since this was put on his radar, and that they had not moved on any of these appeals. He said that his organization had kept the pressure on, or at least the insistence that they move forward with this. He opined that calls directly to the Governor's Office would not hurt, and that they could redouble their efforts; however, everyone's focus during session tended to be on the legislative process rather than items such as this. He said that the odds of them shifting and having a recommendation in time for the aides meeting of February 20, 2026 seemed slim because they had indicated that it was not ready for that.

Commr. Sabatini asked about the cutoff for the publishing of the agenda for the February 20, 2026 aides meeting.

Mr. Carmody was unsure, though they had said that they would have already contacted the County's people if it would be included.

Commr. Sabatini inquired about what other efforts were made from when this process started about six months prior, and what was the earliest stage that they thought they were possibly looking at an adverse situation.

Mr. Carmody replied that this was put on his team's radar shortly after the County filed the appeal with a hope that it could make the December 2025 Cabinet meeting agenda. He stated that he had immediately reached out to them, and that he had been informed that it was unlikely to be on that agenda, recalling that they were looking at February 2026 at the earliest. He said that they made the rounds and informed their Legislative Delegation of the appeal and asked for their assistance, along with staying in contact with the Governor's Office. He related that before midway through Florida Governor Ron DeSantis' term, there used to be almost monthly Cabinet meetings which changed to being around quarterly. He indicated that they had acknowledged that with quarterly meetings and five appeals, the earliest they would be able to resolve any of the appeals was in June 2026.

Commr. Campione said that there could be a letter from the Board to the Lake County Property Appraiser asking him to reconsider and amend his budget to resolve it locally, noting that the Governor's Office had not analyzed it. She added that there could also be a letter to the Governor's Office asking them to consider having a Cabinet meeting prior to June 2026.

Commr. Sabatini opined that they should draft a letter and try to get on the February 2026 meeting, and he questioned how the County could get the funding back, relaying his understanding that it was spent. He also opined that they should hire a second lobbyist to supplement GrayRobinson's efforts, and that they needed to put significant pressure on them. He said that if the County spent $50,000 lobbying on this, it would be $1 million they would be losing if they did not get this. He stated that even if the State awarded the County, it may only be one-quarter of it because it would be too late. He opined that the process was flawed, and that it set them up better for June 2026 because the State would understand that the County would be even louder going

into June 2026. He also indicated that he was agreeable with a second letter to the Property Appraiser's Office, though he opined that it would be discarded, and to authorize the BCC Chairman, the County Manager and the County Attorney to have the authority to hire another lobbyist to supplement these efforts. He indicated concerns for the precedent going into other years, and he then made a motion to let the BCC Chairman, the County Manager and the County Attorney choose someone and get to work immediately.

Commr. Campione pointed out that they had never challenged a Constitutional Officer's budget since she had been on the BCC, and that they operated autonomous offices and were elected individually. She added that they were not under the Board's jurisdiction other than from a budgetary standpoint where their budgets were submitted. She recalled that the Board weighed in sometimes and had asked Constitutional Officers to try to trim things, though this was usually part of a process where they were all trying to be consistent and conscientious. She opined that this item was abnormal, and that she did not want to concern the Constitutional Officers by suggesting that the Board thought that they were going to change how they did their budget process in the future if the County lost this appeal; rather, the appeal was critical because they had a first time Property Appraiser and the Board had opined that the budget did not make sense for why there would be such a large increase for positions for not being hired but were projected out. She opined that there were many irregularities, and that the Constitutional Officers had done a great job in the past. She expressed support for putting more pressure on, receiving an analysis by the Governor and the Cabinet, and having a hearing. She clarified that this was not a slight against Mr. Carmody's group, though noted that they had much going on. She questioned why they would not have someone who focused just on this and see if they could get this hearing.

Commr. Morris asked if the County was going to spend funding on another lobbyist to tell the Governor that he needed to get his Cabinet together and make a decision on this.

Commr. Sabatini opined that lobbyists had other methods of persuading people in friendly ways to do the right thing in public policy.

Commr. Morris asked to confirm that they had not heard anyone's item yet.

Commr. Sabatini confirmed this and opined that Lake County needed to try the hardest so that they would be at the front of the line.

Commr. Morris opined that it was a waste of funding.

Commr. Smith indicated that he did not agree with hiring a second lobbyist to do what GrayRobinson had been doing, especially since two other Counties were in the same position with different lobbyists. He was unsure what a fourth lobbyist would do.

Commr. Parks said that an appeal had been made to the Cabinet for this item, and he opined that the County deserved an answer. He relayed his understanding that there were five applications with three from a Sheriff and two from a Property Appraiser, and he questioned what had gone in favor of a County in the past seven years. He also asked for the legal analysis for it being wrong.

Commr. Sabatini replied that there was not anything in the Florida Administrative Code or formal guidelines that the Administration Commission used to run the numbers and determine if it was right or wrong; rather, they would say that it was too much.

Mr. Carmody confirmed this and opined that the process was in need of some guidelines. He also confirmed that they would eventually hear the appeal, and that once it was heard, it would apply going forward; therefore, if they ruled in the County's favor, this would guide the budget in the following year.

Commr. Sabatini said that he did not see how it played out that way because if they said that the County was right and that the budget increase was unjustified, and if the funding was gone, then on October 1, 2026 the Property Appraiser could ask for another number and they would start over. He relayed his understanding that the previous year's decision did not dictate a budget request that had not occurred yet.

Commr. Parks inquired if they would have to give the funding back retroactively.

Ms. Barker responded that typically, any excess revenue present at the end of the fiscal year was turned back over to the County; therefore, if this item went in the County's favor and it was before the end of the fiscal year, then in theory the County would have that additional $1 million coming back as excess revenue. She added that if they said that 100 percent or 50 percent of the increase was unjustified, then the budget would be amended and the additional funding would come back as an excess fee, provided that it had not been spent.

Commr. Parks asked if it would go back over several years.

Ms. Barker was unsure if the Administration Commission could dictate a future year budget.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that in past cases where the Cabinet sided with the County Commission, it had been decided before the budget so that there was no use of the additional part of the budget.

Mr. Carmody said that he could review the last three or four years to see when the Administration Commission had dealt with these items and what the outcome was.

Commr. Campione asked if it changed the calculus if they knew whether they would receive the funding back or not, versus just winning the case and a determination that it was too large of an increase.

Commr. Parks opined that the most important thing was if they sided on the County's behalf, then it would be good policy moving forward. He was unsure if this affected his decision on the current day on how much of a percentage the County would receive back.

Commr. Campione inquired if the Board already decided that funding received back would go to transportation.

Commr. Sabatini confirmed this. He opined that Mr. Carmody was doing a great job on a number of policy fronts and bills, and clarified that he was discussing a lobbyist who would call the Attorney General (AG), the State of Florida Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and the Governor, along with getting private meetings to explain to them why they should address this. He opined that this 28 percent increase was unjustified, and that they needed a lobbyist who would go right to the decision holders who would put forth an amendment to include this on the agenda for February 20, 2026.

Commr. Sabatini made a motion to allow the County Manager, the County Attorney and the BCC Chairman to choose a lobbyist firm in the next few days to work on this issue until the end of the calendar year, with a particular focus on the February 20, 2026 meeting.

Commr. Smith inquired about the monetary cap.

Commr. Sabatini replied that the standard was $50,000 for a lobbyist in the City of Tallahassee, which was only five percent of what they would possibly recover. He opined that the return on investment would be close to 100 percent in the sense that it was $1 million.

Commr. Campione passed the gavel to Commissioner Parks and seconded Commissioner Sabatini's motion.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Campione which failed by a vote of 2-3, the Board did not approve to allow the County Manager, the County Attorney and the BCC Chairman to choose a lobbyist firm in the next few days to work on this issue until the end of the calendar year, with a particular focus on the February 20, 2026 meeting.

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

Commr. Parks passed the gavel back to Commissioner Campione.

Commr. Campione asked for whatever Mr. Carmody could do to continue to put pressure on, and said that the Board could be in agreement to do another letter and make calls. She also requested for them to ask the Property Appraiser to reconsider.

Commr. Parks opined that the County deserved an answer, and said that he supported getting this as soon as possible.

Mr. Carmody relayed that he could visit the office again on the current day and remind the State of this conversation, along with requesting anything they could do to get this moving quicker. He added that he could also make the rounds at the Legislative Delegation.

Commr. Sabatini inquired if they could put a special emphasis on going right to the Cabinet holders, opining that if this was put in front of Mr. James Uthmeier, Florida Attorney General, he could not imagine him looking at this in any other way than putting it on the agenda immediately to address the situation and protect the taxpayers. He also opined that the Cabinet needed to hear from the County directly.

RECESS AND REASSEMBLY

The Chairman called a recess at 10:50 a.m. for five minutes.

FORM-BASED CODE PRESENTATION

Ms. Kathleen Dial, Executive Director for Development Services, said that they were going through a full Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) update for the 2050 Comp Plan and had contracted with Kimley-Horn for this service. She stated that as they updated the Comp Plan, they would need to begin looking at their LDR to update them to be in alignment with the new Comp Plan. She remarked that the Board would need to make a decision regarding the direction of the LDR as to whether there would be a hybrid of form-based code and Euclidean code, or straight Euclidean code, noting that they currently had straight Euclidean code in the LDR. She commented that staff was seeking direction from the Board for the LDR.

Mr. Kelley Klepper, Vice President for Kimley-Horn, said that there was a core community vision of what made Lake County what it was, noting that "Real Florida, Real Close" was the overarching component which said who they were. He commented that they were challenged by having a large county with a number of different geographies, as well as a number of municipalities which all had their own Comp Plans and codes; furthermore, there were items such as the Green Swamp, and over 30 percent of lands were set aside as conservation or lakes. He said that they were currently working through the confines of SB 180 to ensure that they were not going to potentially be more burdensome or restrictive. He explained that the code had to be founded in the Comp Plan and that it provided the legal basis to say what the vision was and what the densities and form looked like. He then stated that zoning was permitted use, heights, setbacks, densities, parking, landscaping and open spaces. He showed Comp Plan references and said that these were the items where form-based code LDR were mentioned, noting that it was across the entire Comp Plan to say that the County as a whole needed to review and implement LDR, or form-based or urban design which implemented this vision. He said that Appendix E of the Lake County Code was where the LDR were found, and that it was consistent with many other communities. He remarked that they had a diverse economy and a diverse series of land uses in the area, as well as over 28 zoning districts, noting that this did not necessarily include all of the PUDs. He opined that this was possibly excessive for a community of this size, and that they could start looking at where and how these districts were being used and how similar they were, noting that they could possibly start to think if they could consolidate without being more restrictive, or create more simplicity. He showed a Lake County zoning map and said that they had many rural lands, noting that there was a justification behind this. He mentioned looking at the transitions between the truly urban areas and the Green Swamp, to their lakes and their cities. He said that the County had a traditional code with individual districts, uses, and setbacks and heights, and that this could be done as a hybrid or form-based code depending on the location. He stated that they were pretty much Euclidean, and he showed information that his organization had presented as part of Planning 101. He remarked that hybrid had core components of the traditional code but with some of the form-based code design elements included. He opined that a form-based code could be applied countywide, though said that he would not recommend it because it was a change in the way of doing things, noting that it would start to cause much confusion. He added that it would also cause stress on staff because it was also a relearning for them. He stated that everything in the code could be reorganized in a simple format, and that for traditional zoning they would still have the look and feel to emulate some of the information seen in a form-based code. He recalled that his organization was asked how they would address some of the Rural Residential (R-1) and agriculture components they had, noting that they started laying out some of these items and looking at transitions. He opined that there were ways to starting looking at this which would still protect agricultural entities, and commented that something that they started to include in many places was agriculture to non-agriculture types of buffers to protect the existing farmer but still permit the development. He discussed work that his organization had done in Johnston County in the State of North Carolina, noting that it was similarly situated to Lake County. He commented

that some planners would say that a traditional conservation subdivision was a type of a hybrid form of a rural PUD or rural form-based code because it regarded land preservation and was alternative design and development standards; furthermore, this was another tool that the County could continue to expand on to allow the farmer to maintain positive cashflow. He relayed that for hybrid use for mixed-use zoning for commercial, the design and development aspects included what the buildings looked like and the placement of this, noting that they were starting to marry the form-based code components under some of the umbrellas they had within certain areas of the county. He added that something like this, with the appropriate infrastructure, could be appropriate next to a city as well. He commented that every code dictated form, and that form-based code was starting to look at the fill, flavor and linkages between walkability from building design, and that they still had a use table and some of those standards but were getting more into the urban component of communities. He said that they were seeing a cycle come back in the form-based code environment where these items had a positive return on investment by creating communities and achieving an overarching goal of the community for quality design and development without having to drive; however, these projects had to be strategically located and designed. He said that they would still have the equivalent of a zoning map, which was a regulating plan, and that they would still have certain items regarding the types of buildings, the placement of buildings, and where parking and other items could go. He said that instead of saying a location was a zoning district, they would start calling them transects or using different terminology, though it was still the same. He added that they started looking at interactions, and he showed an example of focusing on the form in the City of Titusville. He displayed an example regarding coffee shops, and added that form-based code included availability and adaptability to meeting market demands. He mentioned that residual open space usually became what they defined as open space, noting that this included stormwater ponds and whatever was left over, though in form-based code and some of the hybrid codes they got into meaningful, useful, open and civic space; additionally, this included defining open space percentages and types. He said that there was still compatibility because they discussed certain types of uses and certain heights, and he showed images of downtown walkable portions of the community. He indicated that it made the most sense to do form-based or hybrid components where they had higher densities and intensities, as well as greenfield or redevelopment areas, and parcels on lower speed roadways. He mentioned looking at multimodal activities and physical connections between homes, businesses and parks, along with how they could connect those items together. He also mentioned housing diversity, and stated that they would not recommend form-based code where they had established neighborhoods, commercial areas with limited opportunities for redevelopment, and small parcels on higher speed roads. He mentioned being able to map out where the contexts were, and opined that they needed the full range and to look at the context of the community. He opined that they still needed traditional code, though they could support form-based code in some of these targeted areas, along with mixed-use provisions.

Commr. Campione asked that if PUD zoning was required in each of the primary land uses, could they achieve a form-based code on a case by case basis based on that environment with the PUD giving them this flexibility.

Mr. Klepper replied that it depended on how it was set up, and that if they had a residential PUD, they would likely have small unsupported residential or office there, and that industrial may be office and industrial. He added that with a PUD they were letting individuals write their own code at that point, which meant that staff had to implement and interpret a number of different codes instead of having a framework and guidance to work within.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they would be starting from the premise that they had the elements of what would be required, and the PUD would be the opportunity to see it be put into action with some discretion on the part of the BCC and the Planning and Zoning Board. She stated that her largest frustration with form-based code was where she had seen it applied with results that decisionmakers did not know that they would end up with. She indicated that she would err on the side of more control, and opined that they still had to be able to visualize it and know what it was going to be versus it being open ended. She commented that she would lean more toward hybrid code, and that she liked the predictability of Euclidean code.

Commr. Parks opined that Euclidean code produced more unpredictability in what something was going to look like.

Commr. Campione questioned how this could happen.

Commr. Parks opined that they did not have those kinds of standards, and that part of the issue with growth in the county and other places was that the Board made a decision and the applicant would follow the code in place, noting that staff was interpreting it the way it was. He opined that this was why there was some unpredictability, and that form-based code had more of a predictable outcome and was easier for going through the process. He clarified that it would not take away the Board's ability to make land use decisions.

Commr. Sabatini asked where they were at with SB 180, opining that each good item associated with this could be alleged as burdensome to an applicant.

Mr. Klepper clarified that form-based code did not open it up for one to do a number of things with the Board never seeing it, noting that they would be setting up the criteria with illustrations which indicated what it meant. He said that some communities would want a form based code but still have control over certain items at that point, and that the current code was there, noting that they could consider creating paper districts which could be applied to certain areas. He mentioned that they would not be removing the traditional districts, but rather adding an additional layer of options that could be applied in certain cases.

Commr. Sabatini said that he was agreeable with creating them, and that there were possibly ways to incentivize it.

Commr. Campione opined that there might be something that fixed SB 180, and said that if they adopted it and no one challenged it, then they could move forward. She added that even if it went to the State, it would be arguable whether it would be enforceable or that the Florida

Department of Commerce could do anything about it. She opined that they could keep moving ahead and doing the best thing for the community.

Commr. Sabatini agreed.

Mr. Klepper relayed that in many cases, if one was willing to provide additional architectural features and additional heights or green space, they could possibly grant more units per acre to start incentivizing density. He showed examples which could be set up as optional development.

Commr. Smith asked what was being requested of the Board currently.

Mr. Klepper relayed that they were providing additional information, noting that they were at the strategic point of the Comp Plan where if the County wanted to start moving forward with a code update, then this was likely the right time to start thinking about it. He also asked what the Board liked or did not like, noting that they could ask more questions.

Commr. Smith relayed that this was the first time he saw this, and he inquired if any of the examples shown had been in places where water and sewer was not provided.

Mr. Klepper denied this for the most part.

Commr. Smith said that he was not pro-form-based code. He asked that if there were two businesses that were form-based and one was a bar/lounge and the other was a daycare, was this allowable.

Mr. Klepper clarified that they could set up the code and the uses, noting that the use table was still there. He added that he was not a 100 percent advocate for form-based codes, and that he was more of an advocate for mixed use hybrid codes.

Commr. Smith stated that he would like to review this code with staff and ask many questions.

Mr. Klepper relayed that the current day was more informational and that they were not requesting the Board to vote yes or no. He added that staff was looking to schedule additional one on one meetings with the Commissioners.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the current item was to hear some of the Board's feedback, and said that she wanted them to go through an exercise as if someone brought in an application and show the Board how it worked so that they could see what the end product would be when applying mixed, form-based or Euclidean code. She opined that the Board wanted predictability and to know what they were going to get in return.

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that it was more city based.

Commr. Campione expressed concerns for an example and there not being any place for people to put a car if they had items in their garage, and for street parking.

Commr. Smith mentioned another example which had many individual houses on the Euclidean code, and on the form-based code it was duplexes, triplexes and quadraplexes. He reiterated that he would like to have a meeting to review this.

Commr. Campione opined that form-based code looked rigid, but that they could end up with a space in the middle of a development. She opined that they could take conventional form-based code and blend it together with this result, which the hybrid code could potentially produce.

Commr. Parks recalled that former Lake County Commissioner Josh Blake used to advocate for pocket neighborhoods and helping with affordable housing for the workforce, and that Lake County did not really have the codes to facilitate or incentivize this. He stated that he would support the hybrid code, and he opined that there were urban areas in the county that would never be in a city. He also opined that the code was not working currently because even with conditions in a PUD, they still had to operate largely on what it looked like in the form of it based off the current code. He expressed concerns for this, and opined that they would have the same development pattern until they did something. He also indicated that he liked the idea of moving through examples.

Commr. Smith opined that the Office of Planning and Zoning did a great job, though the LDR did not meet all of the Comp Plan, noting that this was what they were trying to fix.

Mr. Klepper clarified that they were not advocating that form-based code would be in some of the more rural areas, noting that it had to be the right place, the right setup and the right application. He added that it could be locationally based where they had infrastructure and resources to support it. He also reiterated that the Board had the ability to say where and how this took shape.

Commr. Parks expressed interest in doing a pocket neighborhood scenario.

Commr. Campione expressed concerns for buffers off right of way to the beginning of a neighborhood, opining that they needed to be much larger.

REGULAR AGENDA

CITY REQUESTS TO INSTALL AUTOMATIC LICENSE PLATE READERS

Mr. Jeff Earhart, Engineering Director for the Public Works Department, recalled that the County had created Section 3-78, Lake County Code, which basically said that they did not allow the placement of cameras, license plate readers or other surveillance devices within their right of way without coming to the Board to get specific approval. He stated that the current request was for this specific approval to place license plate readers within County right of way, and that they were meant to aid law enforcement when one saw AMBER Alerts or other alerts, noting that they could be used to find individuals with warrants. He clarified that it was not intended to give speeding tickets or enforcement, and that the City of Clermont and the Lake County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) had already done this. He remarked that the current requests for installation were for the City of Fruitland Park, the City of Mount Dora, and the Town of Lady Lake. He mentioned that the Board's packet included a policy statement which said how the municipalities were going to use these license place readers, as well as the specific locations. He specified that the City of Fruitland Park had three, that the City of Mount Dora had four, and that the Town of Lady Lake had 11.

Commr. Morris asked if one company did this.

Mr. Earhart replied that Flock Safety was installing all of them, and that the individual municipalities would pay for the installation; furthermore, there was no cost to the County to do this, but just permission to use their right of way. He added that none of these devices were going on the County traffic signals; rather, they were being placed on posts within the right of way.

Commr. Morris inquired if Flock Safety was making money on this.

Commr. Campione responded that the Cities and the LCSO funded it, and that this was not to give tickets, noting that some Cities had installed cameras which were giving out tickets.

Commr. Sabatini expressed concerns for what the Cities had done, and opined that they need to take a step back on this or do warnings. He then said that he would be voting no on the current item, relaying that he did not trust or like Flock Safety. He indicated his understanding that the nature of the crimes was severe and that they started with accusations, and opined that many domestic disputes started with abandonment or a missing child. He opined that this opened the door to constant surveillance on any couple having a dispute, and that some of the other criminal areas that it was limited to was a much wider door than it appeared on the text.

Commr. Campione asked if the LCSO was using Flock Safety.

Mr. Earhart relayed that it was everyone in the county.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the County had an agreement with the LCSO so they could stop or withhold their approval of the use of the right of ways. She added that there was a report to check when it was utilized and for what purposes, and that it went to the question of if it was being pulled and used for something other than strictly law enforcement activities. She commented that she was not a big fan of this except when she heard the stories of the types of situations that they were able to resolve. She opined that the tool could be extremely important to finding someone who had been abducted, or for any variety of serious situations. She commented that for her, it had always been that this had such a limited application and was for the serious crime, saving people who had been abducted, or trying to track someone down.

Commr. Morris said that he was not a fan of these readers.

Commr. Smith indicated that he was not a fan of stop sign cameras or speeding cameras because they could not tell who the driver was and someone else could receive the ticket for it, though with these license plate readers the police had to stop the car and identify the person inside it; therefore, he expressed support for this. He opined that the Sheriff was good, and that if there was anything occurring with Flock Safety, then the Sheriff would address it on his end.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that they could not pick names and that it had to be an outstanding warrant.

Mr. Earhart confirmed that it was for outstanding warrants, and he relayed his understanding that all they could do was enter the license plate number if it was an outstanding warrant or if a crime was committed; furthermore, it was not searching continuously for different numbers, and it was just specific numbers.

Officer Anthony Buehler, with the City of Fruitland Park Police Department, explained that the main sources of data put into the system to give them alerts were the Florida Crime Information Center (FCIC) and National Crime Information Center (NCIC) for people with warrants, missing persons, and any type of felony vehicle. He added that it did not tell them who was in the car unless they were input into the system and if it was the car linked to that person; therefore, it would not send an alert for an everyday citizen, noting that it would have to be a search, which were extremely audited. He commented that the policy dictated how they audited the

searches and how often they were maintained, along with the disciplinary action for any type of misuse. He clarified that the license plate readers did not generate revenue for them, and that it was strictly for investigative purposes and identifying missing persons, stolen vehicles, stolen license plates and people with warrants.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that if he drove by one, it would read his tag but not report it because he was not on a list.

Officer Buehler confirmed that it would not send an alert unless the vehicle was reported as stolen or if one had a violent warrant for their arrest.

Commr. Sabatini referenced an ordinance item cover sheet in the City of Tallahassee, and relayed his understanding that it tried to specify that this would be limited to just a particular range of times. He inquired if it only looked at cars attached to persons with active warrants.

Officer Buehler confirmed this, noting that this was only if the person entering it into the system linked their name with that car.

Commr. Sabatini stated that he did not support the creation of this, and opined that it was a step toward mass surveillance. He opined that they were safe currently, and that the overwhelming desire for order, control and surveillance was outweighed by private liberty. He also mentioned the chilling effect created in a private citizen who saw cameras everywhere.

Commr. Campione opined that they did not like seeing cameras everywhere and the idea of being under surveillance, though for her the balance was an expectation in the world they lived in that when someone was abducted, they had cameras and the technology to find this person. She relayed that for her, the balance was also that if used correctly, it could save lives and help anyone at any time in the future. She opined that as long as it was done correctly, and if someone could be prosecuted if it was misused, then this would be a safeguard. She reiterated that these license plate readers were not to give tickets, noting that she was against those cameras issuing tickets to people.

Officer Buehler added that the cameras would not be used to generate revenue for their department.

Commr. Morris asked what they paid per month to have these.

Officer Buehler replied that there was an initial startup cost and then a yearly subscription cost. He relayed that they applied for a grant through the State, and indicated his understanding that for his department it was $2,000 per camera per year for the continuing cost.

Commr. Sabatini inquired about the State grant specific to these cameras.

Officer Buehler clarified that it was not specifically for these cameras, and that they applied for multiple grants throughout the year; furthermore, it was a basic safety grant.

Commr. Sabatini said that he liked the present state of safety which was enabled without mass surveillance, opining that they were not safer currently because of mass surveillance; rather, he opined that there were other methods to create more public safety.

A local law enforcement representative indicated that it was in the General Fund budget for his department. He also relayed that the photograph of tags was queried against the database of other numbers; therefore, no one’s information was being passed at any point unless another

law enforcement agency had entered it into a hotlist, noting that any officer on the street running a tag, which they were authorized to do by law, might query a tag which came back to something on the hotlist. He elaborated that it was then up to that officer, and that in cases where it was positive for a hotlist, those officers, by policy, were required that the tag matched the one that they had received in their alert and verify all of the information through dispatch before taking law enforcement action to move forward.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried by a vote of 3-2, the Board approved the following items: the City of Mount Dora's request to install automatic license plate readers within County right-of-way at four locations within the city's limits; the City of Fruitland Park's request to install automatic license plate readers within County right-of-way at three locations within the city's limits; and the Town of Lady Lake's request to install automatic license plate readers within County right-of-way at eleven locations within the town's limits.

Commr. Sabatini and Commr. Morris voted no.

SECOND PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-7 ZONING DISTRICT USE REGULATIONS

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

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

Ms. Marsh requested that if this item was approved, that it be with the errata sheet.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Newton thanked the Board for adjusting this ordinance to better align with the Florida Statutes and to promote best management practices, thereby enhancing the County's basin management action plan (BMAP). She expressed support for the changes.

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

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved, with the errata sheet, Ordinance 2026-7 amending Section 3.01.02, entitled Zoning District Use Regulations, Section 3.01.03, entitled Schedule of Permitted and Conditional Uses, and Section 3.01.04, entitled Key to Conditions in Table of Permitted and Conditional Uses, to be in compliance with Senate Bill 700 and House Bill 211 (2025), creating Section 3.03.00, to be entitled Specific Regulations Regarding Chicken Farms, Slaughterhouses, Egg-Processing Facilities, Hog Farms, and Riding Stables/Academies, and adjusting the zoning

matrix to address statutory changes to the Live local Law set forth in Section 125.01055, Florida Statutes, effective July 1, 2025, pursuant to Chapter 125-172, Laws of Florida.

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-8 WELLNESS WAY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

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

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; REGARDING THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS OF THE LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS: AMENDING SECTION 16.00.02, ENTITLED WELLNESS WAY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS; INCORPORATING THE NEW YARD PATTERN BOOK AS AN OFFICIAL EXHIBIT; INTEGRATING PRINCIPLES CONSISTENT WITH FLORIDA-FRIENDLY LANDSCAPING™; REVISING LANDSCAPING STANDARDS WITHIN WELLNESS WAY; PROVIDING REFERENCES TO OFFICIAL WEBSITES FOR APPROVED PLANT LISTS; AMENDING CHAPTER II, ENTITLED DEFINITIONS; CREATING SECTION 16.00.04, TO BE ENTITLED THE NEW YARD PATTERN BOOK; CREATING SECTION 16.00.05, TO BE ENTITLED LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION PLAN EXAMPLES FOR WELLNESS WAY; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR FILING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Newton expressed support for this ordinance, but said that she would recommend a change in Section 5.1.1, regarding landscape irrigation water supply. She suggested placing a period after "in no incidence shall potable water be used for landscape irrigation." She did not think that they should be using potable water with any new development, and she remarked that in the current session, the Florida Legislature had filed HB 611 and SB 508, noting that both of these bills were going in a similar direction with irrigation.

Ms. Sarah Spatola, Executive Director for the Turf Grass Producers of Florida and speaking via Zoom, indicated that she had submitted comments online, and asked the Board to defer a vote on this issue, noting that there was an upcoming Urban Landscape Summit event on April 21 and 22, 2026. She added that this event would be addressing several similar issues, and that it would be a great opportunity to hear from other entities. She also commented that she wanted to ensure that the Board was aware of Florida Statute 125.572, which had preemption for the installation of synthetic turf, opining that this was in opposition to the intent of the way that the proposed ordinance was presented to create biodiversity and be an environmental protection ordinance.

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

Commr. Campione and Commr. Morris confirmed that they had received an email from Ms. Spatola.

Commr. Campione asked if it made sense to hold off on this item due to the April 2026 summit.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was a great ordinance and that the Board should have passed it previously.

Commr. Campione inquired if he was agreeable with the 25 percent of any turf limitation, and if he thought that yards should be slightly larger.

Commr. Sabatini said that he did not see an issue with what they were doing, noting that he would pass this item and that they could amend it later.

Commr. Parks recalled that they had workshops with installers who were involved with crafting many of the changes. He clarified that this only applied to Wellness Way and that the City of Clermont already adopted it. He opined that there was much compromise, and that it was respectful to them to move forward because there was an understanding that the County would continue to work with them on a regular basis to change if issues occurred. He said that it could be reviewed in six months or a year, and he emphasized that Wellness Way was a different standard, noting that the voters expected a higher bar for all development regarding landscaping within Wellness Way. He opined that it fit the economic mission of Wellness Way, and stated that staff had recommended approval. He mentioned that for the email that the Board received, the question about the pure water budget came up often during the workshops, and that the issue was that people just thought it was focused on irrigation; however, it was a corridor compatible community with a higher bar and was supposed to protect ecology and conservation, noting that there was more which went into the landscape ordinance than just the irrigation side. He opined that if they just said to do water budget only and it allowed flexibility, then they might have some lots which would keep under their 25 inches per year budget, though what they put in may not be reflective of the desired standard for Wellness Way and may not contribute to the ecological services as referenced toward the ecology function of Wellness Way. He recalled that they had agreed to come back and review if one could do a water budget track, assuming that they met the rest of the landscape requirements.

Commr. Campione mentioned giving them the ability in a particular project to submit this as an alternative, noting that the goal was to reduce water usage.

Commr. Parks clarified that this was not the only goal, and that the idea of what they would do moving forward was look at the water budget track and have that, but not change the rest of the code. He commented that synthetic turf was considered impervious, though there were pervious versions, and that there would be still be an impervious percentage amount which would limit putting impervious space down on a lot; therefore, if this was used, it would still count toward an impervious percentage on a lot.

Commr. Campione asked if the new language preempted what was already there.

Commr. Parks opined that it could preempt some things, though the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) had not yet written the rules for it and would have performance standards included. He added that one could not give up the other functions of a landscape code, and that Florida Water Star Gold set 50 percent as a maximum high volume irrigation cap for residential certification, noting that this was not a policy recommendation for turf. He also relayed that the 25 percent irrigable sod standard was consistent with higher conservation water performance, and that they could combine this with the local wildlife corridor and their desire to be something different and to respect ecology and conservation. He opined that the code possibly was not perfect, though they could continue to adjust it, and said that they could invite the Turf Growers Association to be part of the next workshop.

Commr. Campione inquired if it was 25 percent or 50 percent coverage for turf currently.

Commr. Parks replied that it was a 25 percent limit on irrigable sod.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they were asking why there could not be a water budget so that one could irrigate as needed.

Commr. Parks opined that this was also an issue with the water budget, and that they had tried to determine if there was a master controller. He opined that they could possibly limit everyone to 25 inches per year if there was a master controller throughout the whole neighborhood, though he opined that some people would like this and that some people would not. He also opined that there were issues with how effective this could be.

Commr. Morris stated that the County would have to police this, and opined that when there were 20,000 homes there, the County would have a new department checking everyone's yard.

Commr. Parks opined that the printed manual would help with awareness because this was in the code, and he relayed that with enforcement for something large, there would have to be more attention paid to it.

Commr. Morris inquired if the HOAs could do this instead of the County, noting that he did not want the County to be everyone's police on these items.

Commr. Parks explained that the County would do a typical plans review, and then would have an inspection to ensure it was done. He was unsure what else there would be for enforcement beyond this, relaying his understanding that there was a one year follow up.

Commr. Campione opined that the goal was to start with this, noting that one would have a manual and ownership of their property, and she hoped that the manual would be followed. She stated that she did not envision a scenario where it would be a code violation if one tree was traded for another in five years. She questioned if the County would want to ask an HOA to be engaged .

Commr. Parks recalled that there was discussion about this in a workshop about what had been done in some other areas where the HOA was significantly involved for education on this.

Commr. Smith said that in Section 5.1.1, reclaimed water must be used, or the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) needed to authorize it, and he asked who approved that the SJRWMD made the recommendation to authorize the water being used out of the ground.

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, replied that the SJRWMD would issue a permit when the subdivision construction plan was submitted to them for review, and that one would receive a SJRWMD permit to construct according to the engineered plan.

Commr. Smith stated that Section 5.1.4 indicated that compost products utilized for soil amendment purposes shall be certified by the United States (U.S.) Composting Council and that where certified compost was not available, compost test results shall be provided to the County for an examination. He asked if the County would need to hire an expert to ensure that it met the compost regulation.

Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed that they would have to hire someone or outsource this.

Commr. Smith opined that this would cost the County more funding. He then read from Section 5.1.4 that compost needed to be spread evenly over the surface at a rate of four yards per 1,000 feet at a depth of one to two inches; furthermore, they then needed to review the receipt for the compost delivered to the site to verify that compost construction soil standards had been met. He elaborated that this was Section 3, and that Section 4 stated "ensure a rotary tiller is used to incorporate compost depth of four to six inches into the soil." He asked if compost was supposed to be spread to a depth of one to two inches or four to six inches, and if a County employee ensured that this happened.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the developer would have to attest that this was done, and that County employees would do landscaping inspections and plan review in accordance with this.

Commr. Smith inquired if they needed to hire someone extra for this.

Ms. Brooke Moffis, with the University of Florida (UF) Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS) extension in Lake County, clarified that the language said that one would lay out the compost one to two inches in depth, and then work it into the top four to six inches of soil.

Commr. Smith opined that this needed to be written better to be understandable.

Commr. Sabatini opined that Commissioner Smith's questions revolved around enforcement, and that they could pass an ordinance which might have sight ambiguity and then directly instruct staff to interpret any ambiguity in favor of the landowner. He opined that they could pass this item and tinker with it, and that it could be retracted if they did not like it. He opined that they would be pleased with it once they saw how good it would look and what a better quality of life this part of the county would have than some adjacent neighborhoods which did not have healthy restrictions like this.

Commr. Campione pointed out that if building inspectors were trained in the standard of what the augmentation needed to be, then they could possibly have a building official add this to what they did. She opined that there was a way to do it so that they could train the individual who was going there, and she expressed concerns with subdivisions that had nothing that contributed to yards being sustainable.

Commr. Smith said that Section 5.1.5 required a minimum of five shrubs for every 2,000 feet, opining that it was not the government's responsibility or requirement to tell someone that they had to have shrubs in their yard. He then commented that residential single family or duplex must maintain 25 percent turf grass, and that all others shall be planted with drought tolerant grass with no irrigation. He questioned if a person could only have 25 percent of their yard be irrigated grass, and if the other 75 percent had to be non-irrigated until the inspection was done, opining that one could possibly cut into their irrigation line and run more lines to their grass. He commented that Section 5.1.6 indicated that all irrigation systems must be installed and inspected in accordance with the Florida Water Star program, and that landscaping and irrigation were to be inspected by the County and maintained after installation. He asked if the County would hire irrigation and landscape experts, and if it was the County's responsibility to maintain both the landscaping and irrigation. He opined that according to this ordinance, if his irrigation pipe broke as a homeowner, he would ask the County to fix it.

Commr. Parks opined that it was not interpreted that way.

Commr. Campione opined that they could possibly add “maintained by the owner.”

Commr. Smith read that one year after a certificate of occupancy (CO) was issued, a second inspection would be made to verify that the required landscaping was established, healthy and properly maintained. He asked if they would have to hire County staff to visit one year after a CO was issued, and how they would keep records to inspect all of these buildings.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that initial inspections would be done by residential site inspectors which would be under the Office of Planning and Zoning, noting that they would also do the plan review and final inspection. He elaborated that follow up inspections would be by the Office of Code Enforcement, and that if there was an issue, it would become a code enforcement issue for the enforcement of the ordinance.

Commr. Smith asked if the Office of Code Enforcement would have to visit one year after the CO to ensure that everything was established, healthy and properly maintained.

Commr. Campione inquired if it was agreed that there should be a one year inspection.

Commr. Parks opined that this was standard and similar to many Cities, and stated that one would pay a fee for their permits, noting that the County had an enterprise fund for those who went out and inspected.

Commr. Smith was unsure if a City would require a second inspection to ensure that a tree did not die within a year.

Commr. Parks relayed that the City of Clermont did.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that this was done for commercial site plans.

Commr. Smith stated that for Section 5.1.8, regarding homeowners’ education, each HOA and CDD shall provide educational in-person meetings regarding the requirement of this code. He agreed with this, though he asked who would track this and ensure it would happen. He also inquired what would happen if the HOA failed at this.

Commr. Parks opined that there was no way that they would be able to determine whether each person had been educated on the requirements.

Commr. Smith asked why it was in the code.

Commr. Parks recalled that an issue which came up with having irrigation and landscape codes was that people did not know what to do. He added that this was how to educate and inform to be in line with the vision for the Wellness Way landscape plan.

Commr. Smith commented that it was done yearly, and he asked who in the County would track this and ensure that it happened. He opined that it should be done by the HOA or the CDD, and that they should not have this as a County code to put the extra burden on County employees. He also expressed concerns that it could possibly become throughout the county. He opined that it should not be the government’s job to dictate to the individual, and that they should tell the HOAs what was expected, have it in a PUD, and make it part of the CDD. He opined that there were flaws in this which he had pointed out.

Commr. Parks opined that it would be like any other PUD condition and that the HOA would ask about it. He opined that it would come up as a requirement, that someone might say that the HOA had not done this for two or three years, and that the Office of Code Enforcement would be called regarding the meetings. He elaborated that they could say that the HOA was against the code and needed to start having the meetings.

Commr. Campione opined that it was more about letting them know, and that someone could potentially say that they were supposed to have Florida Friendly native plant material and people were removing their plant material. She elaborated that someone could bring it to the attention to the County, and the County could ask if the HOA was having those meetings; however, she did not see the County going there and fining people.

Commr. Smith clarified that he was not against this item in totality, and that he was against what it said because he opined that it was ambiguous. He opined that rather than approving it and then changing it, they could change it to make sense. He opined that it would put a burden on all of the citizens of Lake County if the Office of Planning and Zoning had to hire extra people to do things that came out of the General Fund, unless it was made a municipal service benefit unit (MSBU) in Wellness Way to fund this. He also commented that he did not want to put an extra burden on the citizens for things that an HOA could handle on their own.

Commr. Campione clarified that it came out of permitting fees.

Commr. Parks opined that it was not ambiguous, relaying his understanding that experts worked over several months to do this. He added that they would keep working with the experts to look for any necessary changes as it was implemented, and recalled that they had been going over this for years and that there had always been a plan; furthermore, the Wellness Way plan included that there would be a higher standard for it.

Commr. Smith proposed giving it to the HOAs rather than making it an ordinance.

Commr. Campione opined that the ordinance set the standard and was aspirational to a large degree. She relayed that the hope was that in good faith, people who chose to live in this place and who were given a handbook about Wellness Way would want to do these things and ha ve an HOA that wanted to enforce these things. She opined that it could be planned and done the right way, and then it would be given to the HOAs; furthermore, if the HOAs were dropping the ball, there would be a reminder and neighbors could say that people were not doing things the way they were supposed to. She said that the County had never done this before at this level, though it was a different type of place. She indicated that the item about the turf was her only issue, opining that people wanted places to visit outside, and noting that she would like to see 50 percent rather than 25 percent. She relayed her understanding that if they allowed 50 percent, then they would require the budgeting of water. She opined that someone could take their potable water hose and water their bahia grass, and she also expressed concerns that people would use hardscapes and put things outside.

Commr. Sabatini opined that 35 percent which could be irrigated would be reasonable, noting that there could be future amendments.

Commr. Campione said that there could be 35 percent with the understanding that this could change as they implemented it.

Commr. Parks added that the water budget method could also change, and that they could have a workshop with a report back to the Board.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried by a vote of 3-2, the Board approved Ordinance 2026-8 amending Section 16.00.02, Lake County Code, Appendix E, Land Development Regulations (LDR), entitled Wellness Way Development Standards regarding Landscaping Regulations, with an amendment for 35 percent of the landscape area being able to be planted with irrigated turf grass.

Commr. Smith and Commr. Morris voted no.

Ms. Marsh relayed the following comments that she opined would be good change for this ordinance: where there were maintenance requirements, to ensure that it was maintenance by the property owner; they could clarify in the ordinance that compost would be spread at a thickness of one to two inches and then tilled four to six inches into the ground; and they could change this to say that instead of a second inspection being required, it may be performed by the County, and if the landscaping was not established, healthy and maintained, then enforcement action may be taken or pursued, or they could adjust this to "the property owner will be notified and given an opportunity to cure" so that it was not a mandatory inspection.

Commr. Campione said that she liked the idea that they would let someone know that it needed to be cured if it had not taken after a year.

Commr. Smith stated that he would vote for these changes, though he was still against the ordinance.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Sabatini and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved these changes to Ordinance 2026-8.

PUBLIC LANDS AND TRAILS ACQUISITION ADVISORY COMMITTEE ITEMS

Ms. Angela Harrold, Operations Director for Parks and Trails, Public Lands and Facilities Management, explained that in November 2024 the voters approved a renewal of the public lands bond referendum, authorizing $50 million for conservation parks and trails; furthermore, after this vote the BCC adopted Ordinance 2024-18 and Ordinance 2025-24 amending the Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee (PLTAAC) member requirements. She recalled that the Board appointed the members to the PLTAAC, and that they began their meetings in September 2025. She displayed an overview of the PLTAAC and staff, and remarked that the PLTAAC's main responsibility was to recommend evaluation criteria, as well as conservation and trail properties to the BCC for purchase using the referendum funding. She elaborated that the goal was to support land acquisition which protected water resources, open space, wildlife corridors, parks and trails, and that all recommendations were advisory with final purchasing decisions remaining with the BCC. She provided updates for the last two PLTAAC meetings, noting that meetings were scheduled through October 2026 and were open to the public. She recalled that there had been a request to have meetings every other month, and that staff was working toward setting them up. She said that staff worked with the County Attorney's Office to develop a

workflow process which began with an open application period. She added that staff would conduct detailed reviews at each step, which would include site visits, and that properties would be scored and presented to the PLTAAC for recommendations. She commented that recommendations would then come to the BCC for direction and approval, and that once the BCC approved a presented property, staff would begin a price negotiation where needed, and due diligence would continue. She remarked that once all of this information had been compiled, staff would bring the property back to the BCC for final approval of the purchase price, and then it would move forward to closings. She then discussed the scoring criteria and stated that it was created by staff by first consulting the County's approved master plans for parks and trails, and that they gathered information from geographic information systems (GIS) files, Florida Forever priority lists, the Florida Natural Areas Inventory List, and neighboring county programs. She said that each property could earn up to 49 cumulative points within the scoring criteria, and that the criteria would serve as a tool which organized the positives and negatives of each property to make informed decisions. She clarified that all submitted properties would be shown to the PLTAAC and to the BCC regardless of their rank or if they were ranked at all, and that the BCC was the final authority on all purchases. She reviewed an example of how the scoring criteria was set up, noting that each category had assigned cumulative point values which helped ensure that decisions were supported by data and professional analysis. She stated that additional considerations included the following: at the last PLTAAC meeting, members discussed allowing conservation easements to be considered as part of future acquisitions, and had recommended that staff bring this option to the BCC for consideration; this was a voluntary agreement between the landowner and a government entity; conservation goals could be achieved without full land purchase, permanently protecting natural resources; the land would remain privately owned and the agreement would remain in place for future owners; they could be a cost effective and efficient tool and protect natural resources such as wildlife habitat, water quality, wetlands, forestlands, agricultural lands, and open spaces; and caveats would include that in some cases this could limit public access, noting that staff would recommend that they have a best management practice (BMP) land management plan in the agreement. She then mentioned that the trails criteria scoring system was created in the same way as the public lands scoring, and that it included a focus on the Florida Office of Greenways and Trails priority list. She commented that a focus for this scoring criteria was on trail and corridor projects that aligned with the County's plan and State trail plans, and that this helped prioritize projects that improved connectivity and public access. She added that all submissions, ranked or unranked, would be reviewed and presented to the PLTAAC and then the BCC. She clarified that it was a slightly different scoring criteria than for public lands, and that the priority was given to properties which closed gaps in the trail network, extended existing trails, supported wildlife corridors, and protected natural communities; additionally, these properties would also include site visits to determine eligibility, and could potentially be scored with the public lands scoring document as well, which ensured long term value for residents and visitors. She requested approval of the following items: the Public Lands and Trails Acquisition

Program Process Flowchart; the Public Lands Scoring Criteria, including direction on conservation easements being included; and the Greenways and Trails Scoring Criteria.

Commr. Campione expressed support for being able to purchase lesser interest conservation easements to create more flexibility and make the funding go further in situations where someone was willing to have that restriction on their land. She recalled that she had asked Ms. Marsh about this, and that she indicated that there might be some procedural things that they would have to do with regard to the bond issue to ensure that it was certified as an allowable use of the funds. She said that she also liked the flowchart and the criteria for greenways and trails.

Commr. Morris asked about the consideration to add conservation easements of lesser interest.

Ms. Harrold explained that it would be to allow different types of property purchases to be put forward, and that it would not be a fee simple purchase of the property. She clarified that they would allow for these, as well as a conservation easement, which would allow for the property owner to continue to own the property. She elaborated that if it was agricultural land, then it would continue agricultural practices; however, it would stay in a conservation easement in perpetuity and would never be developed.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that a resident who voted for the $50 million bond could not walk on that property.

Ms. Harrold said that they potentially would not be able to if it was still a working property.

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that they were procuring land for people to use rather than take it off the rolls.

Commr. Campione opined that if they went back to the stated purposes, it came back to conservation; therefore, she opined that it was not necessarily that everyone could walk on each piece of property, and it was more about preserving open spaces, green spaces and places that were conservation. She said that she would not be in favor of a scenario where the funding was used for this 100 percent, though she did not think that they should preclude having some of it be this way.

Commr. Sabatini agreed that it should be a mix, and opined that the PLTAAC should work within the contours of what the BCC generally wanted.

Commr. Parks opined that the appointees exceeded expectations, and that the point with this easement issue was partnership opportunities. He opined that they did not want to have a situation where it was a package deal with the Rural and Family Lands program, the SJRWMD and the County contributing, but staff said that one could not apply to the County because it was an easement. He opined that it could include some properties that had an easement for agriculture.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that it was mainly directed at when they were pooling different resources to create a conservation area, and that they could use the bond funding for this purpose if it helped complete a project.

Commr. Parks stated that the goal was to have access, though there could be situations regarding hundreds of acres with part being in working agriculture and part being in conservation. He relayed that easements could be provided for the public, and that there were examples of this

being done with landowners being indemnified and not being held liable for access through easements. He opined that the Board did not want to limit themselves to not being creative.

Commr. Campione stated that the PLTAAC would make those recommendations and that it would ultimately come back to the BCC, and that they could look at the facts and decide whether it met what the public intended when they voted in favor of this.

Commr. Parks opined that there was frustration from landowners present at the January 2026 PLTAAC meeting regarding why this was not up and running, and he opined that they had to open the cycle back up on the following day to accept new applications.

Commr. Campione asked about the fastest turnaround.

Ms. Harrold replied that it would likely take 60 days for staff to do evaluations, and then it would be presented to the PLTAAC, noting that they would make a recommendation to bring to the BCC. She elaborated that whichever properties the BCC decided to move forward with would then move to the County Attorney's Office for due diligence and price negotiations, and that they were looking at up to one year for closing.

Commr. Smith commented that he did not mind them taking their time, and that it would take this long to do their due diligence. He also opined that if a Lake County citizen could not gain access or have use of a property while the County was using their funding, then it had to be very limited.

Ms. Marsh said that when the County had application-type processes, they typically had an opening date and a closing date. She was unsure if the Board was looking for a constant period for applications, noting that it made it difficult for purposes of getting everything evaluated and allowing the BCC the opportunity to rank properties against each other. She also opined that it would help the County Manager if they had beginning and end dates for the first round of applications because she had to determine how much funding she would have to bond or take a bank loan on, noting that this would also be difficult to do if applications could be submitted at any point during the year. She relayed her understanding that staff recommended an opening date which would be closed, and for them to evaluate those properties and move them to the PLTAAC for recommendation and then bring them to the BCC. She commented that at that point, the BCC could decide whether to purchase properties, and the County Manager could issue the bond. She relayed that once they had this underway, then they could open up a second round, versus keeping it open all year.

Commr. Smith clarified that they were discussing opening and closing for applications, and Ms. Marsh confirmed this.

Ms. Barker recalled that their financial advisor had recommended that they only bond or take a loan out on what they could spend within three years, noting that this was the purpose of the open application period and a set closing period for applications. She also relayed her understanding that the year was getting through the process, and said that they would be approaching one year before closing.

Commr. Campione opined that the easements would be limited situations, and that it would give them the flexibility if they needed this tool.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the following items: the Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Program Process Flowchart; the Public Lands Scoring Criteria, including direction on conservation easements being included; and the Greenways and Trails Scoring Criteria.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE MT. PLYMOUTH-SORRENTO COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to reappoint Mr. Clark Morris, Ms. Sandra Stura and Mr. Tim Kiley to the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Community Redevelopment Advisory Committee, with term expirations of January 31, 2028.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Sabatini and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to reappoint Mr. Jeffery Albright, as recommended by the East Lake Chamber of Commerce, to fill a vacancy on the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Community Redevelopment Advisory Committee with a term expiration date of January 31, 2028.

DISCUSSION ON DISTRICTS 5 AND 24 MEDICAL EXAMINER SERVICES

Ms. Barker provided the following background information: in 2018, Citrus County, Hernando County, Lake County, Marion County and Sumter County entered into an interlocal a greement for cost share of the Medical Examiner services for District 5; the parties amended the agreement in 2021 to add Seminole County to also share the cost and utilize the same Medical Examiner; the Medical Examiner provided services for District 24, which was only Seminole County, and for District 5; all of the work was currently performed at the facility in the City of Leesburg, noting that it was once owned by Lake County, though when Marion County took over the administrative duties for Districts 5 and 24, Lake County conveyed the facility to Marion County; Lake County was not reimbursed, nor did they receive any credit for operational costs for the conveyance of that facility; there had been discussions regarding the allocation of costs within Districts 5 and 24, noting that it was currently based on population; Seminole and Lake Counties currently paid about 46 percent of the total costs, though they only received around 32 percent of the services; it had been brought up that this seemed to be an unfair allocation and they could possibly look at another methodology, and at that time it was not being entertained by the other Counties within District 5; Seminole and Lake Counties then proposed to join together in District 24, which would require redistricting by the State Medical Examiners Commission to move Lake County out of District 5; Lake County took this to the State Commission, which denied the request to redistrict Lake County, though they had indicated that they would like more information and that the two Counties could have their case heard again; on May 14, 2025, the Districts 5 and 24 Medical Examiners Committee met to discuss a proposed plan of separation as presented by Lake and Seminole Counties, and the other District 5 members indicated that they would like Lake County to reconsider leaving District 5; it was advised at that time that they were open to negotiating a new methodology for the allocation of costs for both the construction and operational costs of the new facility; Seminole County had notified the committee that they would be moving on with the termination of the current interlocal agreement and would be constructing their own

facility within Seminole County boundaries, as well as no longer sharing the services of their Medical Examiner; in October 2025, Marion County submitted a counteroffer to Lake and Seminole Counties in which they would support Lake County leaving District 5 and joining district 24; Marion County's offer was that all six Counties, including Seminole County, would work to obtain State funding for construction of a new Medical Examiner facility which would be utilized by Citrus, Hernando, Marion and Sumter Counties as the remaining District 5 Counties; Lake and Seminole Counties would continue to use the current facility, and Citrus, Hernando, Marion and Sumter Counties would be allowed to use the facility until such time as State funding was received and construction of the new facility was completed for the remaining District 5 Counties; and Lake County had reached out to Seminole County to ask about their plan regarding the letter and counteroffer, noting that they started the process of getting a design and construction manager in place to design and build a new Medical Examiner facility, and as such, they were not entertaining the counteroffer as they were moving forward as plan with the construction of the new facility. She said that there were several options up for discussion, and that staff needed direction from the Board; furthermore, the next Medical Examiner meeting would be in the following week. She commented that option one would be to remain in District 5, and she recommended that they negotiate new allocation methods for capital and operating costs for the services of the Medical Examiner if this option was chosen. She stated that option two would be to accept the terms of the counteroffer, negotiate a termination agreement, and negotiate a time certain deadline to receive State funding. She mentioned that the counteroffer did not indicate that there was a timeframe to continue to seek to new funding and construct a new facility; therefore, staff recommended negotiating a time certain deadline for this to occur, such as five years, and if at that time they had not received funding or the construction was not complete, then Lake County would negotiate a purchase price for the current facility since they were not previously paid for it. She related that option three would be to negotiate a termination agreement with Citrus, Hernando, Marion and Sumter Counties, to request the State Commission approval to join District 24 with Seminole County, and to share the construction costs of the new facility with Seminole County.

Commr. Campione opined that with regard to option three, they would need a termination agreement in place if they were to get State Commission approval. She added that she would look at option two as being the negotiated termination.

Commr. Sabatini expressed interest in going with Seminole County, and he asked what happened a year prior.

Ms. Barker recalled that the State Commission had denied the County's request to redistrict, and that they said that they would request more information and that the two Counties could come back and make the request again.

Commr. Smith opined that for option two, the deadline for State funding and for the other Counties to leave Lake County's building should possibly be three years, though if they were not out by those three years, then the County could give them the opportunity to purchase the building. He clarified that they would have the first right of refusal.

Ms. Marsh clarified that it was not really a purchase; rather, it was just compensation for Lake County leaving because they already owned the building. She added that staff would negotiate the value of the building, and that it would not be called a purchase because they owned it.

Commr. Smith questioned what Lake County's cost obligation would be for Seminole County, and said that he would need this information.

Ms. Barker commented that the County had an interlocal agreement, and that it was basically a 50/50 cost share, noting that Seminole County would be the administrator for District 24.

Commr. Smith asked if it would just be Lake County and Seminole County, and Ms. Barker confirmed this. Commissioner Smith then opined that option two was the best.

Commr. Morris agreed.

Commr. Campione inquired if the timeframe of three years would be included in a motion.

Commr. Smith opined that three or four years should be plenty of time for them to know that they had the funding, and then it could take another two years to build it. He asked if it should possibly be five years.

Commr. Campione relayed that it could potentially be between three and five years to give staff flexibility as they negotiated, and she inquired about when Seminole County's termination was.

Ms. Barker believed that the current agreement went to 2029, and that Seminole County was currently moving forward with construction of a new facility. She also relayed that Seminole County had notified the committee that they would be separating.

Commr. Campione asked if the interlocal agreement between Lake and Seminole Counties had hard numbers in it for Seminole County's construction costs.

Ms. Barker denied this.

Commr. Campione mentioned that the Board could potentially give direction that this was where they wanted to go, and she questioned if they needed this other piece of information.

Ms. Barker replied that Seminole County just had this out for bid, and that she could reach out to them.

Commr. Parks opined that this was important because the item was about cost benefit.

REPORTS

COUNTY MANAGER

OFFICES CLOSED FOR PRESIDENTS' DAY

Ms. Barker commented that County Offices would be closed on February 16, 2026 for Presidents' Day.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

TACKLE WAREHOUSE FISHING TOURNAMENT

Commr. Smith stated that he had the opportunity to welcome the Tackle Warehouse Fishing Tournament at Venetian Gardens, noting that it included 150 of the top anglers in the country bringing economic incentives there.

PARKS, RECREATION AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Commr. Smith commented that at the previous day's Parks, Recreation and Trails Advisory Board meeting, it was mentioned that at Palatlakaha Environmental and Agricultural Reserve (PEAR) Park they had a special needs group called the Predators Pickleball Organization, noting that they won a number of gold and bronze medals in the state. He added that there was a nature preserve in PEAR Park, and that they honored Mr. Urban, who was a 101 year old World War II veteran, noting that Mr. Urban and his wife had volunteered at PEAR Park. He relayed that he had also presented Mr. David Clutts, Chairman of the Parks, Recreation and Trails Advisory Board, with an award for 20 years of dedicated service on the board.

COMMISSIONER MORRIS – DISTRICT 5

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEMBER

Commr. Morris recalled a comment about Mr. Dan Tatro serving on the Planning and Zoning Board, noting that he had appointed someone who understood the LDR.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

MISSION BBQ OPENING

Commr. Campione related that she and Commissioner Morris had attended the Mission BBQ opening and that it was great.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

NATIONAL UMBRELLA DAY AND NATIONAL FLANNEL DAY

Commr. Smith said that it was National Umbrella Day and National Flannel Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:31 p.m.

_____

LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____

GARY J COONEY, CLERK