A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

SEPTEMBER 1, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, September 1, 2026 at 9:00 a.m., in the County Commission Chambers, Lake County Administration Building, Tavares, Florida. Commissioners present at the meeting were: Leslie Campione, Chairman; Sean Parks, Vice Chairman; Anthony Sabatini; Kirby Smith; and Timothy Morris. Others present were: Jennifer Barker, County Manager; Melanie Marsh, County Attorney; Misty Spahn, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office; Kristy Mullane, Chief Financial Officer; and Stephanie Cash, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

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

Pastor Tony McCoy, with Hope International Church in the City of Groveland, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, mentioned that the applicant for the Planning and Zoning Tab 2 item had withdrawn their application, and that it would not be heard on the current day; furthermore, Tab 3 was added as an addendum to the agenda after it was first published.

Commr. Smith stated that he would have to leave at 1:00 p.m. on the current day.

CITIZEN QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD

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

Mr. Eric Murgo, a concerned citizen, expressed concerns about Islam coming to this country.

Mr. Edward Lang, a resident of Palm Beach County, indicated concerns about Flock cameras and Islam in the State of Florida.

Mr. Michael O'Leary, a resident of Volusia County, stated that he would like to echo the sentiments of the other speakers, and noted that he was happy to see the pledge of allegiance recited at the meeting. He opined that if the Board would hold true to the pledge of allegiance, then everything would be okay.

Mr. John Galt, a resident of Lake County, expressed concerns about the Islamification of Lake County and about cameras for mass surveillance, and opined that even though he was in favor of proactive policing, the mass surveillance of the nation had to be stopped.

Mr. Paul Adams, a resident of Lake County, opined that the original Community Facility District (CFD) ordinance for the Islamic Center of Clermont was flawed, and inquired if conditions had been met for the CFD usage, such as traffic mitigation, sewer service, and stormwater mitigation. He indicated his understanding that the Islamic Center originally applied for a CFD in

2012 on a nearby larger parcel on Lost Lake Road, and that it was denied because of the lack of sewer service among other things. He commented that they then bought the parcel on John's Lake Road and continued their former intensity on the smaller parcel, and he questioned if there were different health regulations on the different parcels. He asked why this institution had been allowed to operate using a residential septic system sized for a private residence, noting that the original CFD for that parcel had been approved 19 years prior. He inquired if there was a time limit for compliance on a sewer hookup, and pointed out that the usage had expanded to 80 families. He related that this facility was uphill from his property and within 300 feet of his water wells, and he asked that the Board would revoke the CFD for the Islamic Center of Clermont and prohibit all future rezonings on their three parcels adjacent to his property.

Ms. Suzanne Simpson, a resident of Lake County, stated that there were currently 3,421 Muslims in Lake County, which was less than one percent of the population, and questioned if the residents agreed with the Islamic Center of Clermont. She relayed that the State of Florida currently had over 118 mosques, and opined that even though the one in the City of Clermont was doing fine, they did not need any more.

Ms. Connie Hurlburt, a resident of Lake County, indicated appreciation for the speed tables on Waycross Avenue, opining that had been difficult backing out into traffic. She also expressed concerns about Islam.

Ms. Elanah Coulson, a resident of Lake County, commented that the State was considering stronger poaching laws, and that the palmetto berry harvesters who were harvesting illegally were being arrested, opining that everybody wanted to protect the forest and the animals. She indicated concerns about the Embry-Riddle Deep Woods Ranch aviation training facility.

Ms. Nichole Lugo, a resident of Lake County, opined that public safety should come before political correctness, and said that she believed in religious freedom, in peaceful people having the right to worship, and in the right to ask questions. She expressed concerns about Islamic Centers, extremism, and protecting their children, families, and country, opining that protecting every American should never be treated as an opposing goal.

Ms. Betsy Ross, a concerned citizen, indicated concerns about pedophiles and the Quran.

Mr. Jason Kelyman, a resident of Lake County, recited Luke 22:36, and opined that Lake County was not like the City of Dearborn, Michigan.

Ms. Leslie Russell, a resident of Sumter County, indicated concerns about Islam.

Ms. C.J. Blancett, Chairman of the Lake County Chapter of the Constitution Party, opined that a community was more than a piece of property on a zoning map, and that it included people's homes, investments, neighborhoods, quality of life, where families raised their children, where people retired, and where residents had invested years building a place that they were proud to call home. She opined that even though a property owner may have a right to propose a business or development, this did not mean that every proposed use belonged in those locations, and that if approvals came just because someone owned the property, there would be little purpose in having land use planning. She opined that some questions included the following: did a business belong there; was it compatible with the surrounding community; did its intensity fit the character of the

community; and were the concerns of the people who lived there meaningfully addressed. She expressed concern about public participation being ignored, and opined that listening to residents meant more than allowing them to speak at the meeting. She opined that development should complement a community and not overwhelm it, and that residents should not have to continually fight to preserve the reasonable expectations they relied upon when they chose where to build their homes, raise their families, and invest their savings. She asked the Board to look beyond the applications and to look at the neighborhood and the surrounding properties. She opined that the Board should ask if that proposed use demonstrated compatibility with the community, and that if it did not, then it should be denied.

REGULAR AGENDA

LICENSE PLATE READERS IN COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY

Commr. Campione opined that many may have read, received emails, and heard many opinions about this topic, and stated that the BCC had rejected automated ticketing camera requests in the past, noting that at least one City had pursued this but ended up placing their cameras outside of the County right of way. She mentioned that another issue was the license plate readers (LPRs) that the Lake County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) used, and relayed her understanding that they were not capturing images other than looking for particular license plates as opposed to recording all license plates. She opined that the Lake County Sheriff would be the best one to come and explain their position, as well as the technical part of this, because he had the information and could be questioned about it, and that the public could then decide whether they thought it was accurate or not, giving everyone the same opportunities to ask questions.

Commr. Parks commented that the Lake County Sheriff could not be there, and opined that it was important to have discussion with him there. He remarked that even though the Board would like to have serious policy discussion on this topic, as he had the same concerns about privacy as many of the people in attendance, he would like to hear from the Sheriff first.

Commr. Campione related that this was a meeting to talk about the issues and the policies, and opined that everyone in attendance did not want the government watching them and recording everything they did. She opined that the Sheriff had the right to come to a meeting and present his information, and that the appropriate thing to do was to have a public hearing where the Sheriff had the opportunity to present his information.

Commr. Parks opined that since this item was on the agenda on the current day, the Board should discuss it, and that even though he had many of the same concerns, they should not force a decision to rescind policy when the Sheriff had not had a chance to speak.

Commr. Sabatini opined that they should have the discussion, and that he had this item placed on the agenda as a discussion because it was awkward to place a motion on the agenda. He commented that he was going to make a motion to direct staff to revoke any license and allowability of these cameras to be in the public right of way, noting that the BCC was in charge of the right of ways, rather than the LCSO. He mentioned that Florida Governor Ron DeSantis on the previous day revoked all the LPRs, and that 15 other law enforcement officers from the Counties of Duval, Baker, Bradford, Brevard, Clay, Leon, Liberty, Nassau, and others had all

revoked these. He opined that this conversation was overdue, and that the cameras were too much of an invasion of privacy; additionally, he opined that there was an intangible cost on the mental state of people in society, particularly young people who were being filmed 24/7.

Commr. Campione opined that if the Board was going to make a large decision, then they should have all the facts, and that even though it was good to have a discussion, a decision should not be made until the Sheriff had given his information.

Commr. Sabatini opined that since this had been an issue for a long time, there was no new data to exchange. He commented that if the Sheriff wanted to come to the current meeting, then he would respect this decision and take his point seriously; however, he opined that he had everything he needed and was following common sense and his commitment to individual liberty and privacy. He reiterated that Governor DeSantis and other Sheriffs in the State of Florida had shown distrust, and opined that the benefits were not worth the cost. He stated that he would make a motion to direct staff to take any and all necessary steps immediately to revoke the licenses from any of these devices in the right of way, and opined that if the County did this, then the Cities would follow. He opined that if Lake County followed the leadership of Governor DeSantis, the people would respect that, and that this was a common sense decision based on values about privacy and distrust of the surveillance state. He opined that this was not an attack on the Commissioners who voted for this to begin with, noting that there had been a serious public policy discussion where both sides were weighed. He opined that the cameras had created distrust of the citizens against government and law enforcement, and that the BCC could fix it by getting rid of them and going back to the old way Lake County was policed before that.

Commr. Campione opined that law enforcement should be included in the discussion, and that they were not there because this was placed on the agenda as a first discussion; however, she opined that since it was promoted as a decision, many people came expecting a decision to be made.

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

A resident identified as Mr. Crash, a concerned citizen, opined that Flock cameras did much more than what the public knew, and that they read biometrics such as heart rate, fingerprints, and facial recognition, and had capabilities to upgrade the programming system used. He opined that since a private entity owned Florida cameras, it was not just law enforcement capturing the data, and that there was cross sharing of information for sales, such as what they searched, where they went, and how they communicated online. He opined that this was all cross referenced to profile people, and that the goal was to have mass surveillance. He opined that people did not trust their leaders because of what happened during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), and that Flock cameras needed to be eliminated. He asked the County to vote on it on the current day.

Ms. Dora Betancourt, a resident of the City of Mount Dora, expressed concern about Florida cameras, and opined that since she was Hispanic and came from generational communism, she understood what it looked like. She commented that her family legally immigrated to this country because it was supposed to be the land of the free, and opined that losing one's constitutional rights and individual sovereignty was often presented as being for one's benefit. She read the Fourth Amendment of the United States (U.S.) Constitution, and opined that these

cameras were a violation of their basic constitutional rights. She related that the Lake County Sheriff took an oath to protect the Constitution against enemies foreign and domestic, and opined that there was a poison seeping into this county, state, and nation. She indicated appreciation to Governor DeSantis for having the wherewithal and the foresight to see the symptoms of what was creeping into their community, and said she did not want her home invaded. She opined that the BCC was supposed to govern by consent of the people, and that they did not consent to this.

Mr. Liam Nestler, a resident of Lake County, expressed appreciation to the Board for hearing their petitions, and commented that he agreed with everything that was said about the Islamification of the county, noting that was against Sharia law. He mentioned that he also agreed with what had been spoken about Flock cameras, and opined that the cameras did not just report to the LCSO when they had probable cause. He opined that this information was going to artificial intelligence (AI) data centers and could be accessed by others, including the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), and that the BCC had to make this decision. He opined that the residents of Lake County wanted privacy, and that this was a tool that violated their rights.

Ms. Blancett stated that she was in opposition of the LCSO having access to the cameras and demanded the immediate dismantling of them throughout Lake County, including LPRs. She opined that they were installed without a public vote, referendum, or mandate from the citizens that were paying for it and living under it, and that the cameras did not just watch for a stolen car or a wanted person, as they logged each vehicle that passed, building a permanent record of travel on everyone that drove through this county. She opined that the records documented all vehicles by identifying marks or additions and placed them in a nationwide searchable database, and that the system could also access Bluetooth enabled devices within a vehicle, which could be used to identify the occupants. She opined that the information obtained was accessible to strangers and could be used to cross reference a person's relatives and affiliates, and that the cameras had been misused by law enforcement officers. She remarked that the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) had ordered the discontinuance and removal of these cameras from the state roadways, and opined that Lake County should not want to be remembered as defending the system that the rest of the country was dismantling. She related that the BCC took an oath to the Constitution, which included the Fourth Amendment's protection against unreasonable search of the people, and opined that these cameras were not consistent with that oath. She asked that the County take these cameras down immediately.

Mr. Amir Asghar, a resident of the City of Tavares, expressed concerns that the surveillance state was creeping into his hometown where he wanted to raise his family, and opined that the cameras violated the Fourth Amendment and were unsafe in terms of cybersecurity.

Mr. Rick Carlins, a resident of Lake County, commented that there were many companies that had LPRs, opining that they were collecting everybody's information. He opined that this information was being stored and shared throughout other agencies who had access to it, and that even though Lake County was not storing it past seven days, there were others who could. He recalled that there was a meeting about this on August 9, 2022, and that the Lake County Sheriff stated that those who were subscribed to it would have access to it. He mentioned that on August

23, 2022, it was stated that if the ordinance was put into place, it could be pulled at any time, opining that this information went to data centers, which were predictive. He opined that this needed to be banned in Lake County, and that this was what the public wanted.

Ms. Hurlburt opined that the internet was forever, and that when a driver's license was renewed, all the information was put into a database and shared across all entities.

Ms. Gail Carlins, a resident of Lake County, opined that there was a similarity with communism creeping in with mass surveillance and Islam starting out small and then taking over, and that all these data centers were being built to collect information on them. She opined that this was an invasion of their privacy, and asked the Board to get rid of any cameras.

Mr. Ralph Smith, a resident of Lake County, opined that school zone safety cameras were egregious, and that there had not been a child injured or killed in Lake County in many years. He opined that Cities needed to stop using ticketing cameras because it was wrong and was a waste of funding, and that if one appealed one of their $100 tickets, it would be thrown out. He opined that the Lake County School Board was asking for more funding, and that this was a fund making scheme. He opined that the Sheriff was going to use every tool at his disposal legally to help catch bad people; however, he was not in favor of these cameras. He asked that the Board get rid of them, and opined that this it was the right thing to do. He expressed his appreciation to the Board for their service, and opined that the Sheriff was a good man who was trying to do the right thing.

Ms. Kathy Carlson, a resident of the City of Clermont, opined that the surveillance cameras made errors, and that there could be many serious charges if there were claims that one's vehicle was blamed for things they did not do.

Mr. Russel Robinson, a resident of Lake County, indicated appreciation to the Board for their service, and opined that even though the cameras may make law enforcement jobs easier, the Fourth Amendment was there to make sure that it was not easy. He opined that mass surveillance was a violation, and that this should be the reason to make the decision on the current day.

A resident identified as Ms. Angela, a resident of Lake County, stated that she agreed with everybody who spoke.

Ms. Cheryl Pavlacka, a resident of the City of Minneola, related that Senator Josh Hawley, of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Counterterrorism, announced the commencement of a probe into AI powered mass surveillance companies in the prior week, and opined that in a few short years, Flock had created an unprecedented national surveillance network that was pulled into a national database that customers could search. She opined that an innocent woman went to jail because of a lack of accuracy in AI identifying the correct vehicle in Flock's network, and that when it was dropped, another person was found guilty. She indicated her understanding that 71 percent of the alerts flagging stolen vehicles in the State of California were wrong and were a result of unreliable identification. She commented that many Counties and States had banned the cameras, and that she would be speaking on this issue at the Minneola City Council meeting because they wanted to allow the LCSO to install cameras on City property. She

opined that there was hardly any oversight, and that Americans should not be in the dark about their basic privacy.

Ms. Coralie Shaw, a resident of Lake County, opined that these cameras were not just LPRs, and that they had sophisticated recognition software that relayed information back to a database that built profiles on individual people and could identify and track various features of one's car, face, clothing, and Bluetooth enabled devices, such as a cell phone. She opined that even though the cameras helped the police catch criminals, the police had been doing fine without them and did not need these devices, and that the rate at which these devices helped them catch criminals was negligible. She opined that Flock, Axon, and similar companies had no place in Lake County, and that if the Board did not stop them, it would only be a matter of time before there was no privacy while only a handful of authorities would exercise the right control, authorize, and criminalize one's every movement outside of the home. She also asked if the Board would consider a moratorium on data centers.

Ms. Shyer Maguire, a resident of Lake County, commented that she had received a $100 ticket in the mail, and opined that it may not have been her driving the car. She opined that the school zone flashing lights in the City of Eustis were not calibrated properly, noting that the time listed on the ticket was a time when school was already in session. She opined that receiving a warning from a police officer would be preferable to receiving a $100 ticket in the mail, and pointed out that Commissioner Campione had campaigned on getting rid of those cameras.

Commr. Campione clarified that the County did not allow automated ticketing cameras, and said that one could go to court to contest that ticket. She relayed her understanding that the City of Eustis issued tickets throughout the day, noting that when the County was asked for authorized use of automated ticketing cameras in the County right of way, the Board said no.

Ms. Diana Williams, a resident of Lake County, expressed concern about the association of Mr. Peter Thiel, a billionaire entrepreneur, with Flock, noting that he was mentioned in the Mr. Jeffrey Epstein files. She indicated concern about LPRs pointed at children's playgrounds and parks, opining that the cameras were videoing children. She asked the Board to vote for no Flock cameras in Lake County, and expressed support for no planes over the Ocala National Forest.

Mr. Bobby Linn, a resident of Lake County, indicated appreciation to Governor DeSantis for banning these cameras in the State of Florida, and opined that even if the Board could do nothing about the system, they could slow it down. He expressed concerns about tyranny and Flock cameras, opining that the cameras were more than what they said they were, as citizens were being patterned.

Mr. Lang indicated concern about selling liberty for safety and receiving neither, and opined that this was where Flock cameras were heading. He opined that the Board was voted in to defend their families and to speak up for them against encroachments on their constitutional liberties, and asked the Board to be brave. He opined that there was a right in this country to privacy which was guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Murgo expressed concern about surveillance, traffic tickets, and data centers, and opined that there should be no cameras, no surveillance, and no violation of their Fourth Amendment rights.

Ms. Stephenie Winheim, a resident of Lake County, opined that databases were only as good as the information that was put in them, and that since law enforcement was putting in tags to the NCIC databases, there were likely multiple mistakes in there. She opined that law enforcement could catch many criminals without the use of Flock cameras, LPRs, data surveillance, and AI, and that the schools and Cities needed to get rid of the camera systems, as they were inaccurate and violated people's rights.

Ms. Russell mentioned that there was an article in the *Wisconsin Watch* stating that the Dane County Sheriff's Office would stop using AI surveillance cameras after the Dane County BCC pulled the funding from a contract with Flock Safety, and she expressed concerns about AI, surveillance, and communism.

Mr. Brandon Hartzog, a resident of Lake County, indicated concerns about LPR cameras, and commented that when Vetted Security Solutions came to this Board, many questions were asked about the data and who could access it, opining that the LCSO could go into the real time crime center and pull information from different cameras and vendors, including Ring cameras. He commented that instead of this company, the LCSO went with Flock Safety, opining that even though Vetted Security Solutions was a more secure option, the contractors that worked on all the cameras had access to that information to perform their jobs.

Ms. Miranda Brenton, a resident of the City of Mount Dora speaking via Zoom, indicated appreciation to the Board for starting the meeting with prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance as a reminder of the principles that united the people, and opined that even though people had different opinions, religions, backgrounds, and political perspectives, constitutional liberty belonged to all. She asked the Board to vote for the complete removal of Flock cameras and LPRs within Lake County's authority, and noted that on the prior day, the FDOT revoked approvals for LPR cameras on State highway right of way and ordered their removal within 30 days amid concerns about privacy, surveillance, and misuse. She commented that Governor DeSantis had spoken against them, opining that even though public safety mattered deeply, residents did not have to choose between safety and liberty; additionally, she opined that the Fourth Amendment existed because government power was supposed to be particularized, not directed at everyone. She opined that Flock cameras should not be replaced with cameras from another company offering the same type of automatic license plate surveillance, such as Axon, and that since she and her husband wanted to raise their family in Lake County where people of every background would be safe, welcome, and free, she asked the Board to remove the cameras and County funding for these systems.

Mr. John Freson, a resident of Brevard County, opined that Flock cameras could be used for good or bad, and expressed concerns about mosques and Islam.

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

Commr. Sabatini made a motion to take all legal actions to revoke any licenses or deauthorize any public or private entities from placing or assisting in placing any automatic license plate readers in any of the County right of ways or County properties as soon as possible.

Commr. Smith seconded the motion.

Commr. Sabatini commented that Seminole and Volusia Counties as well as the Cities of Altamonte Springs and Oviedo had rescinded the cameras, and opined that directing staff to turn off and remove them would not stop the Board from revisiting this issue later if there was other data that should be presented; however, he opined that this was not a good reason to postpone removing them at the current time. He stated that he felt safe standing with Governor DeSantis and Commissioner Mark Glass, with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE), and opined that every Sheriff in the state would agree with this eventually.

Commr. Campione inquired if there was a procedure for the right of way utilization permits to be revoked, such as timeframes or notice requirements.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, replied that she would have to review the individual permits; however, at the very least, it would not be more than 30 days. She commented that staff would notify them that their permit had been rescinded, and that they would need to remove their equipment from the Lake County right of way.

Commr. Campione questioned if the motion would include following whatever the requirements were for the timeframe.

Commr. Sabatini answered that he kept the motion as flexible as possible so that staff could negotiate any legal obstacles in implementing the purposes of the motion, opining that sending out a 30 day notice would be sufficient.

Commr. Campione remarked that she wanted to ensure that Lake County's rules were followed and consistent with the permit. She pointed out that there were other cameras not in the County right of way, and that the technology would still exist and not go away with this decision, opining that Florida's Turnpike would not shut down its cameras to collect tolls. She opined that these cameras were important to locating AMBER Alert and Silver Alert suspects because when they put a query in the system for a particular person, they were able to find them, and that if a loved one went missing, it would be good if they could be found. She opined that if there were cameras present that were not in Lake County's right of way, it may require other legislative actions if they were to ultimately go away. She commented that she took the Fourth Amendment very seriously, as she did not want to be surveilled or have information collected on her; however, she opined that because she had a cell phone, her data was still being collected.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the anti-Flock movement was one of many steps for people questioning the surveillance state, and that people were questioning what was in their food and medicine as well as what was in their communities watching them and collecting their data. He opined that this resolution was one small step of a journey for people to take back their human autonomy, and that the County should join them in that step and pass this motion.

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that the motion was to get rid of the cameras, and that Commissioner Sabatini was amenable to readdress it when there was more information.

Commr. Sabatini commented that he would not close off the ability of somebody to present evidence to the contrary.

Commr. Morris opined that there were positives and negatives, and that all which had been brought forward on the current day were negatives because the Lake County Sheriff and the experts were not present; however, the Board would have the ability to bring this item back if needed.

Commr. Sabatini clarified that this motion authorized staff to immediately take the steps to revoke the legal authority that these public and private entities had in creating this network of cameras, opining that it would be over. He opined that it was the right thing to do, and that he had enough data for his decision.

Commr. Morris stated that Article 1 Section 23 of the State of Florida Constitution was titled "The Right to Privacy," and said that "Every natural person has a right to be left alone and free from governmental intrusion into a person's private life except as otherwise provided herein. This section shall not be construed to limit the public's right to access public records and meetings as provided by law." He mentioned that this was in 1980, and opined that government may have moved away from that since then.

Commr. Smith commented that when the Board approved LPRs, there were many safeguards in place to protect the citizens of Lake County; however, since technology was moving at such a fast pace, he was becoming more uncomfortable with what was being done with LPRs. He opined that a private company that the County had no control over could do whatever they wanted with this information, and that the information they were receiving two years prior was different than what they were receiving on the current day because of technology. He opined that for this reason, the County should get rid of the LPRs in County right of ways, and that if at some point the County could create its own safe system, then it could be brought back to the Board. He mentioned that even if the County passed this, there would still be cameras on traffic lights for traffic flow purposes; however, they did not take a picture of a person's face or license plate. He remarked that this was done by FDOT, and that the County had no control over that, noting that he was in favor or getting rid of LPRs at this time due to the reasons he expressed.

Commr. Campione explained that cameras at the intersections notified the Public Works Department that the signal was down or out of sync, and said that when the LPR question first came up, the concern was what query could be put in and who could put the query in for the license plate itself. She relayed her understanding that the LCSO had a limited number of people who could do this, and that they did audits every two months, noting that they had not had a situation, such as those seen in other Counties. She mentioned that even though Lake County had a great Sheriff currently, there was the question of what would happen if there was not a great Sheriff or if the LCSO was not following their own protocols, and that the largest concern she had at the time this was authorized was not knowing if they were doing what they said they were going to do. She opined that there had to be trust in the Sheriff caring about the community, and that the County had to give him some tools to do his job. She commented that the AMBER Alerts and Silver Alerts were important to her because she knew of an instance where a criminal who had abducted a 14 year old girl from east Lake County had been found in the State of Georgia because

of the LPRs. She said that hearing about this made her wonder if the County should get rid of this technology, and that she had hoped that the Sheriff could give his presentation. She opined that after hearing all the information, the pros and cons could be weighed and a good decision made after it was fully discussed and vetted instead of a knee-jerk reaction, and noted that this was the reason why she did not want to make a decision in the first meeting that it was brought up. She related that one thing that had changed in the couple of years since they were approved was the technology itself, and that even though the LCSO had to put in a query for a particular license plate because of a security issue, the question now was where did the data go when it was read and who had access to that data. She remarked that this was the issue she was not comfortable with, and that even though she supported the idea of not having the LPRs in the County right of way, the technology was still going to be there.

Commr. Parks commented that he wanted good discussion on this issue and good policy made from hearing all sides of the issue, opining that this was the foundation of the way things operated in this country. He mentioned that he also had concerns about privacy, and hoped that the Sheriff could come to a meeting in the future, noting that there were LPRs in law enforcement vehicles. He commented that he had questions about how were they used, including when a child was kidnapped and when there were places that had banned LPRs, and opined that the Sheriff could still come to a BCC meeting within the following month.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved for staff to take all legal actions to revoke any licenses or deauthorize any public or private entities from placing or assisting in placing any automatic license plate readers in any of the County right of ways or County properties as soon as possible.

Commr. Parks made a motion to invite the Lake County Sheriff to come to a BCC meeting within the following month to have public comment, to ask questions, and to hear what he might have to say.

Commr. Morris seconded the motion.

Commr. Smith suggested that there should be a standalone meeting instead of adding it to a regular agenda since it was such a large topic, opining that it could be a public hearing so that it would be advertised two weeks prior to the meeting.

Commr. Sabatini stated that he would be opposed to that because the Sheriff might decline the invitation, opining that since he had a very large pulpit, he had the ability to communicate his position on the matter. He commented that he did not want to formalize it to the extent that if the Sheriff did not want to come, it could be perceived as doing something wrong.

Commr. Campione opined that it should be a separate meeting because BCC meetings could be very long, it was an important issue, many people cared about it and would want to come, and it would ensure that everyone had notice of it. She remarked that she would be surprised if the Sheriff declined the invitation, and that if he did, then everyone would know that he did.

Commr. Sabatini related that he was opposed because of the strict formality of setting up the meeting, opining that the Board would be forcing his hand. He opined that if a meeting was set and he declined because he respected the County's decision to remove the LPRs, then it could

be interpreted that the Board forced him into a public decision or it could be interpreted the wrong way.

Commr. Parks commented that the Sheriff was not prepared to come on the current day, and opined that since he had great respect for the Sheriff, it would be great to hear from him regardless.

Commr. Campione opined that it would be no different if this was added to a future agenda, and that he could still decide to come or not. She opined that it would be a respectful thing to do.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried by a vote of 3-2, the Board approved to invite the Lake County Sheriff to attend a BCC meeting within the following month to have public comment and to learn what he might have to say.

Commr. Campione and Commr. Sabatini voted no.

RECESS AND REASSEMBLY

The Chairman called a recess at 11:25 a.m. for five minutes.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: REZONING

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, mentioned that staff had asked to move the Annexation Report to the end, and requested to move onto the rezoning agenda items. He then displayed the advertisements for that day's rezoning cases on the overhead monitor in accordance with the Florida Statutes.

Commr. Campione reminded the Board that they were required to disclose any communications they may have had with the applicant or members of the public about any zoning case on the agenda.

Commr. Morris stated that he met with the applicant.

Commr. Smith commented that he met with the applicant and a consultant.

Commr. Campione mentioned that she met with the applicant's planning and traffic people.

Commr. Parks related that he met with the applicant and numerous people in the community over the previous couple of years.

Commr. Sabatini remarked that he posted this item on social media and read about 40 comments, that he read the emails that were attached, and that he spoke with one person.

REZONING REGULAR AGENDA

Tab 1. Ordinance No. 2026-40
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-289
Panther Run PUD (RZ)
Rezone approximately 2,241 +/- gross acres from Agriculture (A) District to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to facilitate a mixed-use development within the Wellness Way Area Plan.

Tab 3.
Rezoning Case # PZ2026-36
Church of God Campground (RZ)
Amend Planned Unit Development (PUD) Ordinance #2014-5 to revise the land uses to include Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) uses, increase the total
number of RV sites and allow a total of twenty-nine (29) permanent RV sites.

Tab 4.
Variance Case # PZ2025-379
Narayana Dental Office (VAR)
A variance to Land Development Regulations (LDR) Section 9.01.06, entitled Landscape Buffer Requirements, to accommodate site development for a dental office with associated parking on the western side of the subject parcel, in lieu of the required Type C, twenty-five (25) foot landscape buffer.

PANTHER RUN PUD (RZ)

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was a large item, and he questioned why it had been on the consent agenda.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that at the time this agenda item was presented to the Planning and Zoning Board, there were no objections; therefore, it had been on the consent agenda. He commented that it was approved by the Planning and Zoning Board unanimously with no discussion, and that it proceeded to the consent agenda for the BCC, noting that staff began to receive some objections when the agenda item was published.

Commr. Sabatini asked if it was policy that it would automatically be on the consent agenda if it was not debated or if no one on the Planning and Zoning Board voted no.

Commr. Smith pointed out that the Board could pull anything from the consent agenda to discuss.

Commr. Sabatini opined that there was a public perception that if something was on the consent agenda, it would generally be less likely to be discussed, opining that this item was not that.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that if there was no opposition at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting, then it would show as a consent agenda item at the BCC meeting; furthermore, if someone attended the meeting and requested for it to be pulled, then it would be pulled at that time.

Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed this. He then presented Tab 1, Rezoning Case # PZ-2025-289, Panther Run PUD (RZ), and explained that the Wellness Way plan was a master plan for South Lake which was approved by the BCC in 2016, noting that there had been some minor changes along the way. He remarked that the Panther Run Planned Unit Development (PUD) was a rezoning proposal in accordance with this master plan for the Wellness Way area, and that the requested action was to rezone approximately 2,241 gross acres from Agriculture to PUD to facilitate a mixed-use development within the Wellness Way Area Plan. He stated that the location was north of Sawgrass Bay Boulevard and south of Schofield Road near the City of Clermont area. He remarked that the subject parcels were designated with a Conservation Subdivision, Neighborhood and Multi-Use future land use (FLU) per the 2030 Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan), and that the applicant was requesting to develop the property consistent with the Wellness Way plan. He displayed the proposed concept plan, noting that it depicted residential areas comprising of single family attached townhomes, single family detached, an age-restricted area, a multifamily apartment complex, a potential high school site and associated recreation areas, and nonresidential uses, which included an employment center and a resort area with associated recreational uses. He said that the base program was 2,559 units, and that it was proposing many

right of way infrastructure improvements; therefore, they were entitled to a density bonus of 65 units, which was two units per acre, of the 32.5 acres of right of way they were donating for infrastructure improvements. He mentioned that the property was located within the City of Clermont interlocal service boundary agreement (ISBA), and that the City had noted that they would not oppose this rezoning if it was approved by Lake County. He said that the rezoning was consistent with the Land Development Regulations (LDR) as it pertained to the permitted uses which were proposed, along with the approval process followed by the applicant, capacity allocations in accordance with the provisions of Wellness Way, and open space and park area. He related that the site also included a wildlife corridor pathway through the development, and that it was consistent with the Comp Plan as it pertained to the jobs to housing ratio, as well as targeted industries, which included education, health services, professional and business services, retail trade, leisure and hospitality, and research facilities. He stated that water and sewer would be provided by Sunshine Water Services, noting that they had provided documentation indicating that potable water and wastewater services were available. He commented that Panther Run was subject to concurrency review by the Lake County Schools planners, and that they were indicating that a proportionate share mitigation may be required at the time of site plan or subdivision plan submittal. He said that Lake County Fire Station 112 was located 4.7 miles from the subject property, and that the dedication of eight acres for a new firehouse was included in this program.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that the firehouse would also be for the LCSO.

Ms. Barker clarified that it was for public safety.

Commr. Sabatini relayed his understanding that for the last two or three years, enrollment in the public school system had declined several hundred students per year, opining that this trend was likely to continue for the next several years. He asked why the public high school component was included, and questioned if more public students would appear in this rural area to attend high school in a declining system if they did not build 2,600 homes.

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that the public school was being proposed in accordance with the direction of the Lake County School Board, noting that the planners had said that there was a deficit for high school in that area, and that a high school would be necessary to serve a program of this scale.

Commr. Sabatini inquired if they had addressed the declining rates of students in the public school system.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that they did not discuss this, and that they specifically discussed South Lake.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that East Ridge High School was not declining because it served all the way down to Four Corners, and that there was a high school need regardless.

Ms. Tara Tedrow, an attorney representing the applicant, indicated that Mr. Blake Drury, with GAI Consultants and representing the applicant, and Dr. Richard Levey, with Levey Consulting, as well as the County, had spent a significant amount of time over 10 years prior coming up with these policies and guidelines. She indicated that this was the most significant

Wellness Way development which had come before the County, and that it was anchored by the largest amount of preserved conservation and open space as well as a wildlife corridor, opining that there were many exciting elements of this project that met all of the County's Comp Plans and goals at it related to Wellness Way.

Mr. Drury stated that Wellness Way was one of the four major strategic corridors that the County's economic development strategy had identified as target areas for growth, and that the goal was to create a place that was different with strategically designed mixed uses so that people could have employment and residential choices in close proximity; additionally, it was about complete streets, regional roadway connectivity, neighborhoods designed to be easy to walk in, and a green strategy that balanced conservation and development. He relayed that the County and the City of Clermont had adopted the same Comp Plan policies and development codes, and that the Comp Plan had its own goal for Wellness Way. He commented that other parts of the Comp Plan, which were contradictory to elements of that goal, did not apply to Wellness Way, and that residential development, as part of the overall strategy, was a way to extend utilities and roads and make the employment sites marketable. He reviewed a map of Wellness Way, and related that the subject property was the largest area of conservation within Wellness Way and was the keystone for connecting the wildlife corridor from east to west. He also reviewed roads in the area, and opined that Panther Run was the place to build the connectivity that continued north/south from Sawgrass Bay Boulevard to County Road (CR) 516, Schofield Road, and beyond, noting that this could create connectivity from U.S. Highway 27 to CR 455. He pointed out that they worked with their neighbors to identify items which would need to be connected at the time of engineering, including utility locations and access, and that their master plan was guided by many Comp Plan requirements. He said that there was a requirement for an open space system with 30 percent of the upland area in the neighborhood and multiuse districts with 50 percent open space in the conservation subdivision district; therefore, a significant amount of space was preserved or built as parks to be connected into the open space system. He said that they had to dedicate a wildlife corridor, and that they had to build the framework of roads onsite, including CR 455, a neighborhood connector road, and infrastructure for neighborhoods and centers. He mentioned that they had employment land that they had to set aside so that it could be built when the market was there, and that they had a prescriptive set of standards for close-to-home parks. He stated that staff gave a recommendation indicating that the applicant was consistent with all of the principles and standards, and that the applicant had to demonstrate their consistency. He said that there were nine principles regarding the mix of uses, roadways, a green strategy, economic development, schools, the neighborhood scale, any interim agriculture uses allowed, and job hubs. He specified that for the mix of uses, there were three large elements to their community, including the preserved open space which connected everything, neighborhoods, and the centers. He commented that they had an overall program, which came from an allocation calculation in the Comp Plan, and that they had no more than 2,624 units and no less than 1,074,000 square feet of nonresidential, which was built on an overall view of Wellness Way. He stated that the multiuse center minimum floor requirement was the maximum of the neighborhood center, and that all of

these items worked together to create a place which had a mix of homes and nonresidential places. He said that the next principle was about regional roadway connectivity, and he reviewed the roads on a map. He relayed that the applicant had to build about 2.9 miles of CR 455 from beyond their site to the north where the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) was ending the offramp, and south to Sawgrass Bay Boulevard, including the piece that was offsite; additionally, they had to build this roadway to the standards of the Comp Plan and the design guidelines, and landscape it to the extent that was required in the guidelines. He mentioned that the connector network was made up of the east/west connector from U.S. Highway 27 to CR 455, and that they would build Old YMCA Road from CR 455 to where it ended at the county line. He said that CR 455 and the east/west connector would be open upfront as a requirement in the ordinance, and noted that the plan was built on complete streets, which meant that there was also emphasis on bike trails and enhanced pedestrian environments. He showed a view of what their east/west road would look like, and stated that homes would be fronting the street. He related that they would have 11 miles of trails open to the public and maintained by the community development district (CDD) or homeowners association (HOA), and he showed this on a map. He remarked that they identified a couple of trailheads with limited parking and other elements, such as restrooms or a pavilion, and that about half the site was lakes and wetlands that they were preserving; additionally, on the upland pieces they were proposing 455 acres of parks, buffers, and amenity stormwater ponds, which was more than the 441 acres that they were required to do. He said that in the area designated as a conservation subdivision, they were able to cluster development to set aside green areas as passive conservation. He reviewed an example of the park system on CR 455, and relayed that the intent of the green strategy from the code was a balance of development, preservation, energy, and conservation. He said that they had a limited number of places where roads had to cross wildlife corridors, and that they were designing them with culvert crossings or bridges consistent with the Florida Wildlife Corridor Foundation design guidelines. He stated that throughout Wellness Way there were places for centers, as well as a requirement to set aside the land. He said that when they did the calculation, they were required by the Comp Plan to set aside 82.2 acres, noting that they were setting aside 186 acres with a broad range of uses. He specified that the intent was to designate it as a center, and that all of the nonresidential uses one could do in a center would be appropriate in that location; therefore, they would get roads and utilities to it, and be able to sell those sites for development that could not be done until they had roads and utilities. He commented that the Lake County School Board had been looking around this part of the county for a couple of years to find a high school site, and that the applicant had redone the plan in this area, talked to the School Board, and advanced to the point where they had a working agreement with them for this site. He clarified that the intent was a purchase at a low monetary amount, and that the goal was to get a site which could serve this area and be connected to the rest of the neighborhood in a way that fit the community. He said that for the neighborhood scale, they were required to design a close-to-home park in the center of the neighborhood so that no one was more than a 10 minute walk from it, and that they designed this so that five minutes would be the maximum. He mentioned that there were standards for the parks, including a requirement for

a certificate of completion of the park before people could move into the houses, and he displayed an image of the intent of what one of the neighborhood parks would look like. He then related that according to the calculations in the Comp Plan, they had land for 3,672 jobs, which exceeded the requirement by more than 10 percent, and that this included extending roads and utilities so that they had pad ready sites which could be acted on. He summarized the following information: they had a mix of uses; they were constructing a major roadway network onsite before residential development; there would be a livable street network and enhanced pedestrian environments; there would be 11 miles of trails open to the public; they had the conservation and open space network; they had a passive park with nature trails being set aside; they were providing more than double the amount of nonresidential required; they had a location for a 50 acre high school site that they were working with the schools on; all of their neighborhoods were compact and walkable by any measure; and they exceeded the jobs requirement by over 10 percent.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Hurlburt asked if the impact fees collected from these developers were a fixed number per unit, and when they were adjusted last.

Commr. Parks recalled that they did the legal maximum number a couple years prior.

Commr. Campione added that Lake County had the highest fees and were not allowed to increase them.

Ms. Hurlburt questioned if they felt the fees were sufficient.

Commr. Campione reiterated that they had the highest fees that they were allowed to adopt, and that they were probably never sufficient to address every need; however, this followed what the State law allowed.

Ms. Hurlburt expressed concerns for Donnelly Street coming out of the City of Mount Dora and a nearby development, opining that it cost much funding. She said that she was unsure if Britt Road was related to construction in that area, and opined that if there was not much money to be made in these subdivisions, then they should not be built. She opined that the residents were stuck holding the price tag and paying property taxes on property value that they had not yet realized. She expressed support for cutting real estate taxes, and said that she would be more open to allowing developers to carry more of the burden of funding infrastructure. She also questioned where the water came from for the subject development, noting that residents had been on water restrictions in summer 2026.

Commr. Parks explained that many times, impact fees would not fund the total road need, opining that this was an issue. He mentioned that with the current item, the applicant would pay impact fees, and that there were also road funding agreements so there would be no gap, noting that the applicant would be responsible for building those roads so that everyone else was not paying for them. He then recalled that 12 years prior, he had worked with the Cities to start the South Lake Regional Water Initiative, which had factored this type of development into those projections. He added that the conservation requirements to conserve water, which had strict landscaping, was tied to this long term projection to meet the need, and opined that since everyone was susceptible to meeting this, there could be enforcement issues with landscaping, etc.

Ms. Nicole Marie, Executive Director of Eco Roots Sanctuary, indicated her understanding that Lake County created Wellness Way because growth was coming, and that the County wanted housing, employment, roads, infrastructure, and open space planned together rather than disconnected development, opining that Panther Run included meaningful parts of that vision. She requested that the Board not approve this item before two fundamental questions were answered, and she asked if this plan would permanently protect a functional regional wildlife corridor, which included the following: the corridor's exact acreage; minimum width; precise boundaries; external connection points; necessary uplands; required design for road crossings; who would hold the easement; who would independently monitor it; if its management or enforcement would be funded permanently; and a dated Florida Wildlife Corridor Foundation recommendation, technical review, and a project specific corridor map incorporated into the ordinance as enforceable conditions. She also asked if there was a complete infrastructure plan, noting that since staff had stated that the project's transportation impact could not currently be determined, the traffic impact analysis could not be approved without revision because of other items being considered later. She opined that when boundaries, responsibilities, and enforcement standards were not clearly defined, future Boards, staff, developers, and residents inherited that uncertainty, and that correcting problems later became more difficult. She asked the Board to continue this rezoning to a date certain, and to require the applicant to place Florida Wildlife Corridor Foundation recommendations into the record, incorporate the applicable standards into the ordinance, clearly map and permanently secure the corridor, including its external connections and road crossings, and provide an approvable traffic analysis with enforceable infrastructure funding and phasing responsibilities.

Ms. Williams expressed opposition to any more rezoning of agricultural land in Lake County, and she indicated concerns for wildlife and the wildlife corridor. She also shared some wildlife statistics, opining that animals depended on this land. She opined that rezoning agricultural land contributed to the death of ecosystems, and expressed support for not having planes over the Ocala National Forest.

Mr. Hayes, representing Showcase of Citrus and Mr. John Arnold, said that they had met with the applicant, the County, and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and that the meeting with the applicant proved to be positive, as the developer and the owner agreed to work together on issues. He clarified that his client was not opposed to the zoning and the development, but that they wanted to ensure his property was protected regarding access, utilities, etc. He opined that Mr. Arnold's ownership of Showcase of Citrus would help contribute to the environmental resources, and he opined that they should not currently approve anything that locked in the entitlements which could not be changed later. He mentioned that they had discussed the main connection to U.S. Highway 27 at Frank Jarrell Road, which was a county road, and stated that the applicant was willing to work with them on utilities, an easement, and access, noting that there were easements in place.

Mr. Jack Butler, a Planner with Butler and Butler and representing Mr. Arnold, opined that it was a good plan, and emphasized that a concept plan had been put forward. He opined that

there was much uncertainty about where exactly the east/west connector needed to go in the western part, and that there was heavy truck traffic going through this property in some areas where the concept plan showed greenspace and trails. He opined that the County should recognize that the transportation facilities in the rectangular area on the western side where the ordinance said that the development had to be generally consistent with the concept plan may have difficulty being generally consistent, and that there was still much work to be done in that area to be able to handle the traffic there currently, support the continuation of the agritourism development, and to work harmoniously with the new residents so that there would be no complaints.

Mr. Egor Emery, a resident of Lake County, expressed opposition to this rezoning, and opined that this section of the Comp Plan was designed so that one could not really oppose this development. He opined that they did not have to go forward with paving all of the State of Florida, and that they had to recognize that they needed open space for animals and people.

Ms. Faith Attinger, a resident of Lake County, asked how they would eat when all the farmland was paved over, and she recalled the McKinnon Groves item. She opined that constituents had repeatedly requested compromise and consideration, and she indicated concerns about the Board approving items like this.

Mr. Arnold, owner of Showcase of Citrus, submitted photographs of some of the equipment they used for access for the agritourism operation, and relayed that his organization was a tourist attraction according to Google. He clarified that he was not present to oppose the development, and that he was present to submit for the record that he needed continued access to two parcels that they operated in, noting that they were separated by property that the east/west connector would go through. He said that his agritourism operation needed to be able to go from the western parcel through easements to the eastern parcel, and that they had 50 waste trucks per day associated with the conditional use permit (CUP), which were 18-wheelers with 53 foot long trailers that were 75 to 80 feet in length overall; therefore, he opined that they needed a large traffic circle where Frank Jarrell Road connected to the east/west connector.

Commr. Morris asked if the two parcels were Mr. Arnold's property, and Mr. Arnold confirmed that they were his. Commissioner Morris then inquired if Mr. Arnold gave the applicant the ability to put the connector road in between them.

Mr. Arnold replied that the applicant had purchased the property between his eastern and western parcels, and that he had an easement to get from the east to the west.

Commr. Morris questioned if Mr. Arnold wanted the applicant to put a roundabout in so that he could turn his 18-wheelers around.

Mr. Arnold clarified that there were two areas of concern, including approximately 600 feet east of U.S. Highway 27 at the beginning of the east/west connector road close to U.S. Highway 27, opining that the truck traffic did not need to go through that neighborhood and needed to stay out of the east/west connector. He indicated that he was ensuring it was known that he wanted to continue taking this burden, noting that the trucks could also be odorous. He said that his main objective was to get a large roundabout, noting that there was currently a stop sign to turn off the east/west connector into his business, along with a simple access road; furthermore, he

opined that this would not accommodate the 18-wheeler traffic. He opined that the developer had acknowledged that they were an advocate of traffic circles, and he expressed support for this. He also indicated that he was willing to work with the developer, and mentioned that if additional private property he owned on the north side of Frank Jarrell Road was needed for the traffic circle, then he would be willing to accommodate it. He said that he did not want his business to get lost as a sidebar to this large development, and that he was in favor of the development.

Commr. Morris inquired how many loads of waste he was hauling per day.

Mr. Arnold replied that it varied, that they served the community, and that they prioritized their account.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that it was debris waste.

Mr. Arnold clarified that they took biosolids from wastewater treatment plants, and that they only took material with as low odor as possible, noting that they composted it with hurricane debris and wood waste to turn it into fertilizer to be used on the farm and grow grass for their exotic animal operation, which was a tourist draw, as well as it being used on other farmland.

A resident identified as Ms. Nicole, who lived near the subject development and was speaking via Zoom, expressed concerns for the following items: individuals utilizing U.S. Highway 27 to visit businesses at Four Corners; increasing water costs, noting that they were currently in a phase three extreme water shortage; housing taking longer to sell in the area, questioning if there was a need for additional houses; and losing the beauty of the City of Clermont. She also questioned how the parking in the new development would be enough for the people.

Ms. Morgan Walkinshaw, speaking via Zoom, asked the Board to choose to be a protector, opining that with every development and pop up city, they were one step closer to losing the way of life they loved, along with species. She opined that this ideology was ruining the state, and she expressed concerns about the state being bulldozed and paved over in the name of profit.

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

Commr. Smith pointed out that there was a parcel of land in the middle of Panther Run that the applicant did not own, and said that he wanted to ensure that this person had access to the parcel.

Ms. Tedrow confirmed that they had access via an easement, and that there were also conditions in the PUD ordinance discussing the development's requirement to provide cross access and connection points to adjacent property owners.

Commr. Smith inquired if the applicant had been working with them for access.

Ms. Tedrow replied that they had reached out to the applicant in the past week, and that they had some recent meetings to discuss design-level issues. She stated that if the County told the applicant to build a traffic signal, for example, then the developer was required, at no cost to the County, to donate all required right of way for all transportation improvements, and that if a roundabout was requested by the County, the applicant would have to give all the right of way to do it.

Commr. Smith indicated that he wanted to ensure that the easement was not any less than what they currently had.

Ms. Tedrow said that the applicant could not change this, nor did they propose to modify the easement.

Commr. Smith remarked that the applicant had nonresidential job creating projects, as well as residential projects, and he asked when the nonresidential projects would start in relation to the residential projects.

Ms. Tedrow replied that one of the requirements was the buildout of transportation infrastructure, and that they were providing all utility lines and about five miles of roadway, which included the CR 455 extension and the east/west connector road, noting that those would give access to the centers on the property so that they would be pad ready for commercial to tie into. She related that the Comp Plan specifically laid out the ratio of jobs to housing in Wellness Way, and that one of the Comp Plan policies was titled "the timing of nonresidential uses." She explained that it omitted a requirement for there to be commercial or nonresidential provided at any juncture of the development; rather, it said that the way the County was going to get commercial and nonresidential was by the provision of upfront infrastructure, which they were required to do at their cost under the PUD. She opined that once this site was developed out, there would be a large need for this type of development and the commercial component; additionally, the applicant was following all of the Wellness Way guidelines, which put into place the opportunity for the commercial to come into the designated centers.

Commr. Smith questioned if the applicant would start the nonresidential projects once the infrastructure and roads were finished.

Ms. Tedrow responded that there would be some on U.S. Highway 27 and some on the eastern corner of the property where they had two designated centers, noting that this required them to put the connector roads in to get there, and that they could not have commercial prior to the infrastructure being put in.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that for the east/west connector on U.S. Highway 27, the State government would tell them where the ingress and egress would go.

Ms. Tedrow confirmed this, adding that the applicant had to work with the State for all of their transportation design.

Commr. Smith opined that it might be nice to have a wildlife corridor sign there.

Ms. Tedrow stated that they had been working with the Florida Wildlife Corridor Foundation for the proposed design, and opined that it was the most significant wildlife corridor in the county.

Commr. Smith opined that it was the best one that they had seen in the county, along with the open space that they did not have to provide. He opined that it was almost like a rural conservation design.

Ms. Tedrow mentioned that this much preservation was by design in the Comp Plan.

Commr. Campione asked about the timeframe on the Lake/Orange Connector.

Commr. Parks remarked that he represented Lake County on CFX, and that the first half of the road up to CR 455 would be open in six months or less. He indicated his understanding that for the second half, they were starting construction, clearing, and final right of way, and that they would have the full connection by the end of 2028.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was the most significant and important vote that the Board would make in many years in any topic area, and said that he was shocked by the breadth of the proposal. He opined that they could not really discuss rezonings in Wellness Way without discussing the Wellness Way Comp Plan, and that there was nothing they could do about this currently; therefore, he opined that it would be a distraction to debate whether Wellness Way and the Comp Plan was a good idea. He opined that even though he respected the law and understood what the Comp Plan said, Wellness Way was likely the worst and most misconceived change in Lake County land use ever proposed, and that it had accomplished none of the things it promised and created a host of issues which destroyed the quality of life in this part of the county. He opined that the County needed to adhere to the Comp Plan, and stated that the Comp Plan expressly implicated reservations for agricultural use in Wellness Way. He mentioned that the Wellness Way components of the Comp Plan said that agricultural use as a zoning was an important part of Wellness Way, and opined that there had been a philosophy advanced that they needed to maximize what was allowable under the Wellness Way Comp Plan and eliminate as much agricultural usage as possible. He opined that they were not obligated to do this, that it was not a good idea, and that it went against what the Comp Plan said, which was that agricultural use was always supposed to be a contemplated use within Wellness Way. He expressed concerns about eliminating agriculture, and said that when he was voting on land use, he was making a decision for Lake County hundreds of years in the future. He opined that the unspoken philosophy which belied the decisions of each rezoning within Wellness Way was that the complete elimination of agricultural use was a good thing, and that agriculture was in the way of what Wellness Way obligated them to do. He opined that the current agricultural orientation of the land in this area served a legitimate public purpose and should continue to do so, and that these hasty large acreage decisions which permanently changed the fundamental use of the whole county, based on the zoning, were short sighted. He opined that the reasons why the Board should be voting no included the following: agriculture was an expressly contemplated use; there was nothing wrong with keeping it that way; it was short sighted; it would create a host of issues throughout all of Wellness Way and the county to hastily move into this high density development currently; and they would be considered hypocrites to the 14 Cities in Lake County if they were building a microcity outside of city limits and continuing to build these microcities around the county, destroying and undermining the distinction between rural and urban areas. He opined that this was not the right thing to do, and that since there were 14 cities which were constantly growing, the Board needed to be protecting agricultural uses in the county. He opined that the host of issues within this area compelled him to review the purpose that the agricultural zoning served, and that they needed to keep it this way. He stated that he did not want to lose credibility in their wider argument of trying to constrain the Cities to grow inside their urban areas by approving a development that would be

larger than at least three of the cities, and opined that this was not a healthy long-term vision for the county. He opined that there were possibilities of a better type of rezoning that did not call for the total elimination of 2,241 agricultural acres in a single vote to be replaced by apartments, houses, and tenuous commercial commitments that he believed would result in CVS Pharmacies, storage units, and the type of commercial development that was generally not good for the county and destroyed their identity, and he encouraged the Board to vote no for the many reasons he outlined.

Commr. Smith left the meeting at 1:01 p.m.

Commr. Parks indicated concern about Commissioner Sabatini not being supportive of Wellness Way, and recalled that in 2019 Commissioner Sabatini had put an appropriation with the City of Clermont when he was a Representative. He opined that this was the closest thing the County had to a joint planning agreement (JPA) with the City of Clermont, and that since the City had the same standards as the County, they would be upheld to the same standard with Wellness Way. He displayed an appropriation that Commissioner Sabatini had put forward, and opined that Commissioner Sabatini was supportive of this at the time. He said that it was an economic center, and opined that they needed job centers with high standards. He recalled that this had been discussed since 2016 as an urban service area, and that it was done in conjunction with the City of Clermont. He commented that even though he was in support of trying to promote agriculture, the developers had owned that land before the Commissioners were on the Board.

Commr. Sabatini recalled that he was in the State House in 2019, and that Commissioner Parks and the BCC had made it one of the County's top priorities to request $4.5 million to allow the City of Clermont to allow future development by tapping into water and wastewater. He opined that allowing this area to have water and wastewater could not be interpreted as believing that doing high density projects in the area was a good idea, and said that he did not believe it then and did not believe it at the current time.

Commr. Parks commented that the Board had been supporting economic development for a number of years to establish job centers, and that there were still only three in the county. He hoped that the Cities would also improve their development standards as the County had been trying to do, including in Wellness Way, opining that it was the highest standard for development by far. He opined that he would rather it still be citrus groves; however, it was not up to him.

Commr. Sabatini opined that it was, and that this was why he had the authority to vote yes or no on the project.

Commr. Parks opined that it was up to him to ensure that this was done properly, noting that there were entitlements already associated with this.

Commr. Sabatini pointed out that the current zoning was slightly over 200 homes under the agricultural use.

Commr. Parks said that the applicant met the criteria of Wellness Way.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was a legal misnomer, and that under the criteria of Wellness Way, they had a range of options and that it had to be based on the evidence; however, he opined that there was nothing obligating them to increase the intensity at this time.

Commr. Parks commented that it was zoned Agriculture, but there was a policy that said the Wellness Way criteria oversaw the Agriculture zoning.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was not for the entire Comp Plan, and that there would not be any agriculture left under the rate that they were changing the use of the land.

Commr. Parks opined that if they wanted to have agriculture succeed in the State of Florida and Lake County, one needed to stop buying groceries from major chains and start buying local produce, along with supporting agritourism locations. He added that the regulatory environment for agriculture was beyond the current discussion.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the current item was a radical request, and that the factors in the Comp Plan dictated that the Board should vote no for the host of reasons he outlined. He opined that the Board was not legally obligated to vote for this, and that if this trend of development was allowed, there would not be any agriculture left in the county.

Commr. Parks commented that there were a number of requirements that the applicant had to comply with, and opined that people needed to know some of the history on it.

Commr. Campione remarked that the subject property was not designated Rural under the County's Comp Plan, and that throughout the county there were numerous places designated Rural, along with areas of rural protection. She said that many of those places had Agriculture zoning and were used by people who had agricultural lifestyles, large parcels, and livestock; furthermore, there were numerous places with pastures. She opined that maintaining and preserving the character of Lake County meant trying to preserve as much of the Rural designated land as possible, and that the four strategic corridors established in Lake County were critical to the concept of preserving rural land because they designated the places where they had created expectations for growth centers, job creation, and residential growth, with a resort type setting in the subject case. She opined that the County was trying to direct those types of uses to places designated for them so that they could protect other areas from sprawl, and pointed out that for years the east/west Lake/Orange Expressway had been proposed, designed, and was now under construction, noting that they had property next to this large regional connector. She commented that of all the places that Commissioner Sabatini had decided that he wanted to protect and preserve agriculture, he was selecting this location, opining that it should be the locations already designated as Rural rather than a place with the impression of being an urban center. She opined that this went hand in hand with what the County had argued to the Cities with regard to directing growth to the places where the utilities existed and following what the Comp Plan said, and recalled that the County had asked the Cities not to annex into their rural areas and rural protection areas (RPAs), opining that the current item was not hypocritical to that because this was an area designated on the plan for this level of use. She opined that the wildlife corridor was great, and relayed her understanding that there was an area where 50 percent of uplands were preserved. She opined that the applicant was doing all of the things that the County wanted other developers to do, and were exceeding them, and that if this was how growth had occurred in Lake County 20 or 30 years prior, the many things that people complained about currently would have been addressed. She said that the applicant was building internal roads, which the County had been working on

for years, and giving the Sawgrass Bay Boulevard residents the ability to go north and south without utilizing U.S. Highway 27. She opined that the north/south connectors were an important part of the strategic corridor, as well as the Lake/Orange Connector and the job creation in Wellness Way, noting that this was always the intent. She opined that it would have only been subdivisions if there had not been a master plan for the area, and that there would not be the network of transportation improvements being shown on the current day with a total of four east/west connectors. She opined that job creation happened when one could reach locations targeted for this, and that if the goal was to protect the rural areas and agriculture, this was not that location; however, there were other locations where this needed to happen.

Commr. Sabatini mentioned that there were 14 urban centers in the County, and that a plan had been made by a previous BCC to create new economic centers; however, he opined that each proposal in those centers massively increased sprawl and housing density. He said that they were bringing people to take the jobs, and questioned who they were creating the jobs for. He expressed opposition to the four strategic corridors for job creation.

Commr. Campione clarified that the Christopher C. Ford Commerce Park was not a residential development.

Commr. Sabatini opined that protecting rural lands by creating four high density sprawling centers had been a failed policy, and that the rural areas were being destroyed everywhere. He opined that in the City of Tallahassee they were making laws to make it easier and faster to clip the wings of the RPAs, and asked if the County was going to ignore this and stand by this vision of four economic zones where they were going to create 2,600 homes with one rezoning. He questioned how many more rezonings were coming and how many had already happened that were accompanied by no new jobs.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that there would be about 3,600 jobs. She commented that the corridors corresponded to major transportation networks, and that the Wekiva Parkway was being envisioned when the Wolf Branch Innovation District was designated. She added that the subject area was a strategic location with the east/west connector, and that the Christopher C. Ford Commerce Park was there because of Florida's Turnpike and U.S. Highway 27. She opined that the Minneola Interchange would be a strategic center, and that it had come to fruition regarding the job creation component. She also mentioned that there were many distribution opportunities and manufacturing at the Christopher C. Ford Commerce Park, noting that this had been envisioned. She opined that if they did not place these uses into a plan, then they would just get housing developments; however, they already knew what the Comp Plan yielded from the City of Clermont south. She opined that they would not have gotten the east/west and north/south connectors, nor would they have the open space requirements, trail requirements, or landscape requirements for drought tolerant landscaping, noting that all of this was put into this plan.

Commr. Sabatini opined that there was an express part of the code which protected agricultural buffers, and that it was a good idea to have an agricultural buffer coming into the county which physically differentiated all the sprawl around it from the emergence of a different

place. He relayed that this had been lost in the City of Mount Dora, and opined that voting no on this item would not shut down the entire economic center. He opined that the rapid rezonings in this area were happening in such a way that there would be no agriculture left, and that even though it was a potential site for job growth and development, the Board was not obligated to vote for this just because the code indicated that there was some allowable development. He indicated that he was fine with the property staying in its current use because he was looking at it longer-term, opining that the long-term vision for the county would be damaged by this development.

Commr. Parks opined that the long-term vision of the county had been damaged because they had not done planning like this in prior years, and he questioned if Commissioner Sabatini was in favor of piecemeal growth and going back to the status quo, which included strip centers, etc. He commented that for years, there had been contemplation and turning down applications, and that there had been much work to try to get the best out of it, noting that he wanted to ensure that if it was done, that it was done the right way. He stated that there was work with the Florida Wildlife Corridor Foundation to ensure that there would be connection, and that the culverts or underpasses were designed according to the Foundation's standards. He mentioned that it was a corridor-compatible community, and that there were two wildlife corridors in Lake County, including the Green Swamp, which the subject property connected through, and the Wekiva area in north Lake County. He opined that those connections were severed over the years through agriculture, citrus production, cities, and urban sprawl as a result of poor planning and piecemeal growth, and that the subject property was the opposite because it tried to protect this location.

Commr. Sabatini opined that it would be less protected than with the current zoning.

Commr. Campione opined that agricultural uses received much leeway, and said that she was unsure if it was a fair statement to say that having it be Agriculture was a greater protection to the wildlife corridor; furthermore, she opined that there was much that farmers could do that developers could not do. She also mentioned that the west side of U.S. Highway 27 was the Green Swamp and the protection area, noting that little could be done there.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the Board would be voting to eliminate 2,241 acres of agricultural land because of a concept which went against the overall Comp Plan.

Commr. Campione disagreed, and opined that they had a Comp Plan to anticipate future land uses. She praised Commissioner Parks for spending hours on trying to get in front of development, anticipating that it would happen, trying to do something unique that would create transportation connectivity, protecting wildlife, and creating something other than the usual sprawl seen all over the county.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was a dangerous interpretation of how land use should work, and that it automatically gave a favorable position to land use which went against what he opined was best for the county due to the planning factor.

Commr. Parks opined that he had asked many difficult questions, and that he had not been easy on this development; therefore, he disagreed with what Commissioner Sabatini had said. He then questioned the last time agriculture had occurred on the subject property.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the State had incentivized every type of use other than agriculture, and that the price of the land had increased to the point where the market did not create incentives for people to want to do this. He opined that long term, they would be causing more harm to the state, and that these high urban areas would continue to grow because of the cities. He opined that the Board had the opportunity to hold on to agricultural land, which was contemplated in the Comp Plan.

Commr. Campione remarked that they had a Comp Plan that they tried to follow, opining that this was where they were coming from; however, she opined that Commissioner Sabatini was basically wanting to ignore the Comp Plan. She opined that they were trying to preserve the areas designated as rural and recognize the areas that were not, and that Commissioner Sabatini wanted everything to be treated the same.

Commr. Sabatini stated that they were one of the fastest growing counties in the state, and that if they voted no, they would still have a large eclipse of rural land, agricultural land, and urban sprawl. He asked the Board to do the minimal thing, which he opined was to vote no on a 2,241 acre land use change on agricultural land.

Ms. Tedrow noted that Florida Statutes defined urban sprawl as "a development pattern characterized by low density, automobile dependent development with either a single use or multiple uses that were not functionally related, requiring the extension of public facilities and services in an inefficient manner," and opined that they did not meet the definition of urban sprawl. She opined that there was no case law that would classify this as urban sprawl because of the way the Comp Plan had placed them in an urban service area and had set forth and mandated that there be certain development patterns, opining that when people bought property, especially in the Wellness Way area, they bought it on the premise that the Comp Plan 10 years prior set forth exactly where development should be targeted, the way it should be developed, and a set of standards that was more onerous than anything that the County had ever developed or adopted. She remarked that those standards created certain investment backed expectations for landowners, and opined that the Board could only vote against it if there was competent and substantial evidence that was presented. She opined that County staff's professional recommendation was considered de-facto competent and substantial evidence in favor of this development, and noted that there had been nothing presented on the record against it other than a desire for there to be agricultural uses. She opined that there was not any court that would review a decision stating that it was denied because the Board felt like there should be more agricultural land when the Comp Plan very specifically did not rezone all of the properties because it mandated that landowners had to come in later with PUDs, and that they had done exactly what they were told to do under the guidelines set forth in the Comp Plan and the LDR. She opined that even though she appreciated the desire to have certain lands stay agricultural, it was disingenuous from a planning perspective to say that lands with multiuse logistic designations, job center designations, conservation subdivision designations, neighborhood designations, and a development pattern that was being placed there within a plan that they had submitted which followed every one of those guidelines were somehow wrong or were given an unpredictable pattern of development, noting that this level

of growth had been anticipated for 10 years. She opined that sometimes it took time for things to get to the right place of development, and that this was what free market capitalism did. She pointed out that the City of Minneola was one of the four strategic centers, noting that it was a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) about 20 years prior. She opined that it was currently a booming center with great commercial and industrial opportunities being developed, and that this was because it sometimes took developers coming in and infrastructure being in place for it to be commercial ready, which was what this project was going to do. She opined that even though there may be a difference of opinion from an ideological or philosophical standpoint about whether agricultural land should or should not remain agricultural, there was not going to be County mandated farming, and she asked the Board to vote for this project that was in compliance with the standards set, as well as with the State of Florida and case law on how rezoning should be evaluated.

Commr. Sabatini questioned if the legal argument was that the agricultural use of this land made it inconsistent, incompatible, or illegal by leaving it the way that it was.

Ms. Tedrow explained that at the point they presented an application, the County had to evaluate it under the standards that were set forth for a quasi-judicial decision, and that since the only standard under case law was competent and substantial evidence, the County was constrained by having to make a decision under that evidence. She elaborated that the Board could not just say that because it was agricultural on the current day, one was not allowed to ever come forward with a rezoning application, noting that the Comp Plan said that they had to submit a PUD for any development to occur anywhere in the Wellness Way area.

Commr. Sabatini opined that a better plan could be proposed that would respect the agricultural uses of the Comp Plan in the Wellness Way area, and that currently it was a 2,241 acre property with the total and complete removal of all agricultural use on that land.

Ms. Tedrow clarified that the agricultural use was for tax purposes, and that there were cows grazing on the land; however, there was no working farm. She remarked that the land was cleared uplands, which was fertilized and mowed, and was not a native habitat, noting that the beautiful sanctuaries and native habitat would be within the preservation and protection areas. She mentioned that they were sold land with a price tag reflecting the entitlements that existed because of the Wellness Way plan that was created so that the County could start directing growth in a logical and efficient way that looked at how housing, nonresidential, and employment generating uses were accommodated.

Commr. Sabatini opined that it was absurd to suggest that keeping it as an allowable agricultural use or any future application that allowed some agricultural use would be illegal and that any attempt to try to preserve an agricultural use on this land could not be based on competent substantial evidence contemplated by the code.

Commr. Campione commented that this was an explanation of what the law was in the State of Florida and what the investment backed expectations were for people who purchased the property.

Commr. Sabatini pointed out that they bought agricultural property.

Commr. Campione opined that since this was within a comprehensive land use plan that specifically designated the uses they were requesting on the current day, it created a certain type of entitlement.

Commr. Sabatini asked if leaving the land agricultural would make the County subject to a legal challenge.

Ms. Marsh replied that in order to deny this rezoning, the Board had to have substantial competent evidence to support denying it based on the standards established, and that this would determine whether or not it stayed agricultural.

Commr. Sabatini stated that in the Wellness Way Comp Plan, it said that agriculture shall be allowed and permitted as one of the guiding principles of the plan, allowing interim and permanent agricultural uses, and that it described all six FLU categories within Wellness Way. He referenced Section 1-8.2.1, and said that they were intended to provide for a broad range of compatible complementary uses, including employment, housing, recreation, agriculture, and conservation. He mentioned that the land was currently agriculture and doubled as conservation, and opined that these were principles that gave discretion to keep it in the current zoning. He opined that it did not close the door on any permanent rezoning in the future, and that the evidence was clear that the total and complete elimination of all agricultural use on the property was not served by the plan.

Commr. Parks opined that agriculture could be a use in the Wellness Way area, and that nobody would prevent that on future applications that came forward, noting that one of the targeted industries for the economic development plan was agricultural research and technology. He opined that this plan would set the County up to attract that kind of industry rather than the typical commercial piecemeal development associated with strip centers along major roads. He mentioned that this area had form-based codes, and opined that this was how to make economic centers become a reality.

Ms. Tedrow commented that even though this was an existing agricultural zoning, the Comp Plan allowed people to continue having agricultural uses on their property if they wanted to so that there would not be a conflict with them continuing to farm, noting that this was similar in other areas of the State of Florida; however, this did not mandate that those operations had to be in existence, as it was just a permissible use. She remarked that the Board had to look at the plan in its totality along with the LDR in an evaluation of the application at the point in which they triggered this consideration, noting that before the current day, this was not a decision for the Board to make. She related that when it became a decision for the Board in a quasi-judicial setting, competent and substantial evidence was case law, and that they were not asking for anything outside of the scope of what the County told them they should ask for at some point with a PUD, including where they should put things, how they should design them, and the way they should do it, noting that they had done this. She mentioned that even though there may be differences of opinion, the law was clear and the Comp Plan was clear.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the Board could pass the plan keeping the residential density at 210 homes, and inquired if this would be legal. He opined that the legal argument was that

there was an obligation to move from 200 residential units to 2,600 residential units on this parcel.

Ms. Tedrow clarified that there was an obligation at the point when they submitted an application for a rezoning that the application would be considered under the parameters of competent and substantial evidence, and that this was what they had placed before the BCC, noting that when they triggered a decision in a review by the BCC, it had to be done under the parameters of competent substantial evidence.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried by a vote of 3-1, the Board approved Tab 1, Rezoning Case # PZ2025-289, Panther Run PUD (RZ).

Commr. Sabatini voted no.

CHURCH OF GOD CAMPGROUND (RZ)

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that Tab 3, Rezoning Case # PZ2026-36, Church of God Campground, was to amend PUD Ordinance 2014-5 to revise the land uses to include Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) uses, increase the total number of recreational vehicle (RV) sites, and allow a total of 29 permanent RV sites on the property, and that the Planning and Zoning Board recommended approval of this application unanimously. He commented that the location was at 33926 CR 473, in the unincorporated City of Leesburg area, and that the subject parcel was developed with a place of worship, cabins, pool, gymnasium, cafeteria, lift station, package plant, meeting room, active recreation fields, four-unit dormitory, a caretaker residence, and various accessory structures. He related that the subject property was located within the City of Leesburg ISBA, and that the City of Leesburg's Planning and Zoning Department had no objections to this request. He mentioned that Ordinance 2014-5 allowed 23 RV spaces, and that the 18 spaces west of CR 473 were supposed to be removed by December 31, 2023; however, the owner did not remove them. He remarked that the owner was requesting that the ordinance be amended so that the number of RV sites could be increased and stay permanently.

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that the RVs were currently there permanently even though it was not zoned that way.

Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed this, and said that the Office of Code Enforcement was involved and was working with the owner, noting that the owner had applied for a rezoning to see if he could come into compliance with the current use of the property.

Commr. Campione questioned if the purpose of the rezoning was to bring those into compliance, or if there were other uses being asked for.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that this was to allow the RV sites and to expand the commercial corner as well.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that there was a sewer treatment plant of some type, such as a package plant, and opined that it had issues, it had an odor, and it occasionally shut down. She asked where they were going to get their utility services if they were adding uses.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the City of Leesburg provided documentation that they would not accept wastewater from an RV park, and that they did not have the sewer capacity available for this project. He commented that the City did have water available, noting that the applicant would be utilizing their current wastewater system.

Commr. Campione inquired how the Board could ensure that this was brought up to appropriate standards if it would regularly shut down and had to be repaired.

Mr. Fitzgerald relayed his understanding that they had to abide by State inspections.

Commr. Campione asked if that sewer system was going to serve the added commercial use.

Mr. John Stockham, a consultant representing the applicant, stated that the property would continue to use the flow of 100,000 gallons per day; however, if the septic system reached the end of its life, it would require replacement with a distributed wastewater treatment system (DWTS) or an enhanced system. He commented that they had applied for a permit with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to renew the system, and that it was in the development agreement for them to upgrade the system if necessary. He mentioned that the two acre parcel at the corner of CR 473 and Camp Street that they wanted to split off for commercial would have its own commercial septic system, and that this would likely become a convenience store or retail store as part of the C-1 uses.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the proposed commercial would have to come in as a separate site plan at the time they had an end user, and that this was just a concept. She remarked that if it came in as a site plan, then it would have to meet all the County site plan requirements for landscaping, architecture, and setbacks.

Mr. Stockham confirmed this, and said that it would have to meet everything in the LDR.

Commr. Campione asked why the owner could not go to a DWTS now, knowing that there were issues with the package plant.

Mr. Stockham commented that it was an option.

Pastor Demetris Presley, with the Church of God, stated that there were several options they were considering as opposed to the package plant, and that they currently had some comprehensive reviews to see how this would work. He related that they had discussed some different options with the City of Leesburg and what it would take, and that he was working with their engineering firm to come up the best option for the current site as well as any future development.

Commr. Campione remarked that she was reluctant to allow an increase in uses and something that was not supposed to be there to begin with unless the package plant was completely upgraded or they went to the DWTS.

Commr. Morris inquired how long it would take to get their engineering done.

Pastor Presley answered that they were about another three months from finishing this, and that they had been given some options that they were considering. He commented that FDEP was working with them as well to meet those requirements, and opined that within the following six months they should have that figured out.

Commr. Morris related that he would be more comfortable if he knew what was going to happen before he approved this, opining that the applicant could come back in six months whether they had their answers or not.

Pastor Presley remarked that he would like to come back sooner if it was determined before then, and explained that the original plan came under a different administration, which brought on some of those fines that came along with it. He relayed that they were currently trying to ensure that they met the right standards, and that they had been working towards it over the previous 12 months. He mentioned that without this being clarified, they would be held up on meeting the rest of those standards.

Commr. Campione questioned if those living in the RV sites were associated with the church.

Pastor Presley replied that some were associated with the church; however, they were open to the public.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the spaces were rented out on a month by month basis, and that they were not park models sitting there permanently. She remarked that she did not have an issue with the concept of this type of RV park and the ability for them to use it for income.

Commr. Sabatini left the meeting at 1:58 p.m.

Commr. Morris asked if the additional six sites would be for in-and-out renters.

Pastor Presley answered that they were, and that since they had camps that came during the summer, some came with their campers and would park them there for that week or two weeks before they left again.

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that they had 18 sites under the package plant, which would have to be dealt with, and inquired if the commercial lot was just for storage.

Mr. Stockham replied that the two acres on the corner was for the proposed retail, such as a gas station or general retail, and that it currently had an adult congregate living facility proposed for that corner; however, this would not occur if they had a C-1 use for the retail.

Commr. Campione expressed concern about the sewer issue, noting that she had heard complaints. She related that she went there to look at it, and opined that it was in terrible shape, noting that people lived behind there in site-built homes and neighborhoods. She stated that she did not want to approve something that would increase this issue, and opined that it would be good to solve that issue in addition to allowing the additional sites.

Commr. Parks inquired if they would be able to decide soon on whether they would redo the package plant or obtain a DWTS, and asked if their discussions with FDEP were ongoing.

Pastor Presley explained that it was a matter of coming up with the engineering drawings on the best way to make the improvements, and that they would be improving the drain field within the following six months, noting that they were waiting on the approval from FDEP for the permit to do so.

Commr. Campione wondered if the Board could do a conditional approval based on those issues being addressed or if the applicant could be required to come back once it was done to ensure that it was done the right way.

Ms. Marsh commented that the ordinance could be modified to included whatever conditions the Board desired; otherwise, the Board could table this item to a date to be determined.

She mentioned that if it was tabled to a specified date, then they would not have to pay to have it readvertised, noting that six months would give them until March 2, 2027.

Commr. Campione opined that this would give them time to get their sewer issues worked out.

Pastor Presley related that they had taken this property over two years prior from the previous team, and that there were fines for the site plan not being completed based on what the PUD required at that time. He commented that even though those fines had been halted, they were required to get this approved so they could proceed with the site plan on the portion with the RVs to eliminate the code enforcement liens. He indicated concern that if they waited another six months, then the fines may continue, and that they had been suspended up to the date that this was figured out.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that there was a financial issue, and asked if they would be in a better financial position in six months than they were currently.

Pastor Presley stated that they had the financial means and were trying to find the right plan based on some of the changes that had taken place since this was requested. He remarked that the houses that were behind the property were newer houses that were not there at the time of the original plan, and that this had required some additional modification with the State on requirements. He commented that they were trying to balance out what they considered grandfathered in and what they wanted in order to meet the new standards.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that the applicant was depending on an approval to move forward with the site plan so that FDEP would see it; however, the Board had to approve the use change. He questioned if the applicant was going to change the package plan substantially.

Pastor Presley answered that they had proposed to improve it and redo it.

Commr. Morris opined that this would take time.

Commr. Campione opined that it was a very small space and a small package plant area.

Pastor Presley related that in another month, he could bring back more concrete plans.

Commr. Campione opined that this would make more sense, and that the applicant could bring the engineer and show the Board where they were at in this process.

Ms. Marsh stated that if the Board tabled this item to the following BCC meeting, it would be on October 6, 2026.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that the Office of Code of Enforcement would leave this case closed until this issue was resolved.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried by a vote of 3-0, the Board tabled Tab 3, Rezoning Case # PZ2026-36, Church of God Campground (RZ) to the October 6, 2026 BCC meeting.

NARAYANA DENTAL OFFICE (VAR)

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that Tab 4, Variance Case # PZ2025-379, Narayana Dental Office (VAR), was for a variance to the LDR for landscape buffering to accommodate the dental office and associated parking on the western side of the property in lieu of the required Type C, 25 foot

wide landscape buffer, and that the location was at 4950 State Road (SR) 19A in the unincorporated City of Mount Dora area.

Commr. Morris opined that this was the only way this land would be able to be used.

Commr. Campione mentioned that there was an optometrist office and another building there as well.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that no other property in this area had the landscape buffer requirement, and that it was abutting an entrance ramp. He remarked that the property had a restriction on it for development, and that they wanted to put the parking up front where the buffer would be installed. He showed a conceptual plan of the proposed building, and said that if approved, staff would work on a formal site plan.

Commr. Campione inquired where the access was.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the access was through the shared driveway that came in off SR 19A, and that the road in front of the property was just a shared access road.

Commr. Campione questioned if all the trees there would come down in order to put in their parking lot.

Mr. Fitzgerald answered that they would, and stated that once staff moved forward with site planning, they would go through tree removal evaluation and tree mitigation, as they would with any commercial site.

Commr. Campione wondered why there was not an application to the City of Eustis.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that annexation was generally voluntary, and that they had not annexed this property.

Commr. Campione asked if the City of Eustis had commented on this variance.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the City of Eustis had not had any objection to this.

Mr. Pedro Esaki, representing the applicant, said that he did not know yet if they would have to remove all the trees, and that they would have to look at the tree survey and the tree removal plan, opining that they may not have to remove all the trees. He mentioned that nearly 50 percent of the site on the east side was composed of wetland buffer, and that any trees within that area would not be touched, noting that they would try to preserve as many trees as they could. He pointed out that there was not enough space after accounting for the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD)/Lake County 50 foot average wetland buffer on the east side.

Commr. Parks remarked that they would have to maintain that buffer as undisturbed.

Commr. Campione inquired how much square footage the building would have.

Mr. Esaki replied that the dental office would be approximately 2,200 square feet, which was a little larger than a single family home.

Commr. Morris related that he did not know what else could go there.

Commr. Parks commented that he would be less inclined to give a variance for something that had a drive through, and opined that a dental office would be a low impact use.

Commr. Morris wondered if they would have water and sewer from the City of Eustis.

Mr. Esaki remarked that through correspondence with the Cities of Eustis and Mount Dora, neither could provide utilities for this site.

Commr. Morris opined that having well and septic would be worse next to the wetland area.

Commr. Parks commented that there was a DWTS option.

Mr. Esaki mentioned that accounted for in this site plan was the 100 foot setback from the wetland, which was 75 feet from any wells and five feet from the buildings. He pointed out that there was a triangle section on the site plan that was intended to be a septic drain field, and that it met all the requirements.

Commr. Parks asked if he could commit to the DWTS technology as a higher level of treatment instead of a regular septic system.

Mr. Esaki said that he could not speak for the applicant on this matter.

Commr. Campione opined that it was odd approving a septic system for a dental office adjacent to a lake even though there were nearby utilities, which were not available.

Commr. Parks opined that the Cities did not want to provide utilities, and inquired if this could wait 30 days to see if the applicant would be interested in addressing the lack of sewer with DWTS or some other advanced treatment.

Commr. Campione pointed out that if the Board did not approve the variance, then the site would not be developed, and indicated concern about the sewage treatment. She asked if they could bring back a tree survey so that they could see what trees would remain.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried by a vote of 3-0, the Board tabled Tab 4, Variance Case # PZ2025-379, Narayana Dental Office (VAR) to the October 6, 2026 BCC meeting.

ANNEXATION REPORT

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that the City of Leesburg had notified the County that they intended to annex approximately 65 acres north of Plantation View Drive, west of U.S. Highway 27, and that this included the following: the current Lake County zoning was Agriculture; the proposed City zoning was City of Leesburg PUD; the current County FLU was Urban Low Density; and the proposed City FLU was Estate Residential. He mentioned that they intended on proposing a mixed use residential and commercial development consisting of the maximum of 56 detached single family residential units, 40 townhome units, 35 residential condominium units, and approximately 38,000 square feet of commercial space; additionally, this development would also accommodate the Lake Ridge Trail. He stated that the County land use and the municipality's land use had similar density, and that the actual proposal for the allowable development was two units per acre in this development, which was half of the maximum.

Commr. Morris opined that it was a downzoning.

Commr. Campione inquired if this was in the Plantation at Leesburg neighborhood.

Commr. Parks mentioned that this was in Commissioner Smith's district, and asked if the Board needed to comment on it on the current day.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that these reports were for informational purposes for the Board, and that the City of Leesburg Commission meeting would be on September 14, 2026.

Commr. Parks opined that this could be brought back when Commissioner Smith was in attendance.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that this was emailed directly to Commissioner Smith, and that he did not receive any response.

Commr. Campione opined that since the residents of the Plantation at Leesburg would receive notice, they could go to the City meeting. She said that she was comparing it to the situation with Royal Highlands where there was a controversy with land that was part of their original PUD, and that the Board took the position of protecting the PUD in its original form. She pointed out that this was a different situation, and that this land was not part of the original plan, opining that this could be brought back when Commissioner Smith was present and there was sufficient time to comment on it. She then mentioned that there was a resident in the audience with a planning and zoning notification for a case not on the agenda, and opined that the Office of Planning and Zoning could get his information so that he had the correct meeting date.

Commr. Morris commented that this was for Saint Gertrude Corporation, which was on Lake Unity Nursery Road, and that the Board had not addressed this case yet.

Mr. Fitzgerald related that this item had to go back to the Planning and Zoning Board, and opined that even though it was tabled to a date certain, they should readvertise the meeting to the abutting property owners.

CLOSED SESSION

Ms. Marsh stated that this item was to call a closed session for collective bargaining on September 8, 2026.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved to conduct a Closed Session regarding Collective Bargaining Negotiations on September 8, 2026, pursuant to Section 447.605, Florida Statutes.

REPORTS

COUNTY MANAGER

LABOR DAY

Ms. Barker commented that County offices would be closed on Monday, September 7, 2026 in observance of Labor Day.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

COMMENTS ON THE MEETING

Commr. Parks relayed that he wanted to compliment Commissioner Campione for the way she handled the meeting, opining that it was a very difficult meeting. He also expressed appreciation to Commissioner Morris for being respectful.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:26 p.m.

_____
LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____
GARY J COONEY, CLERK