A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

OCTOBER 6, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, October 6, 2026 at 9:00 a.m., in the County Commission Chambers, Lake County Administration Building, Tavares, Florida. Commissioners present at the meeting were: Leslie Campione, Chairman; Sean Parks, Vice Chairman; 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; Mary Burns, Chief Financial Officer; and Stephanie Cash, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

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

Pastor Michael Watkins, with Friendship CME Church in the City of Tavares, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, commented that there were no changes to the agenda 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. Egor Emery, a resident of Lake County, relayed his understanding that there was a separate millage rate for Panther Run, and opined that it looked different from the millage rate he paid. He also indicated his understanding that there was a proposal for a high school in that area, and wondered if the developer would be selling the land for less than they paid for it, noting that he wanted more details on this.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the millage rate was in the Wellness Way area.

Ms. Barker questioned if Mr. Emery was speaking about the Wellness Way millage or the Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee (PLTAAC) millage.

Mr. Emery answered that it was the Wellness Way millage.

Commr. Campione commented that this was a municipal services taxing unit (MSTU) that only applied to the Wellness Way area.

Ms. Barker clarified that it was for enhanced maintenance in the Wellness Way area.

Mr. Emery relayed his understanding that it had nothing to do with the Panther Run development.

Commr. Campione indicated that this was correct other than the fact that Panther Run was in Wellness Way, and that it would be contributing. She relayed her understanding that the

purchase price for the high school site was below market price as opposed to the entitlement price.

Commr. Parks added that it was fully funded.

Ms. Cindy Newton, a resident of Commission District 4, expressed appreciation to Commissioner Campione for speaking at the Cassia Flower Native Plant meeting, and indicated appreciation to Commissioner Parks for being part of the panel on water at the Film Festival in the City of Clermont.

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Consent Agenda, Tab 1, as follows:

COUNTY MANAGER

Recommend approval to allow Commissioner Campione to participate and vote using an electronic platform on items included in the October 13, 2026 agenda due to extraordinary circumstances.

There is no fiscal impact.

ANNEXATION REPORT

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, remarked that there was one annexation report, which came to them from the City of Clermont, and that it included the following: it was 15.52 acres; it was south of Hooks Street; the current County future land use (FLU) was Regional Office; the proposed City FLU was Commercial; the current County zoning was Urban Residential (R-6); the proposed City zoning was Planned Unit Development (PUD); the current County density allowed one dwelling per 10,000 square feet of commercial or six dwelling units per acre under the zoning allowance; and the proposed City density was 12 dwelling units per acre. He showed an aerial map of the property, and noted that this property was part of a project proposal that was denied without prejudice by the BCC on December 9, 2025. He commented that the Fox Hill proposal, formerly known as the Clermont West planned commercial development, was set to be heard by the Lake County Planning and Zoning Board on October 7, 2026 and then by the BCC on November 3, 2026; however, this annexation item would also be going before the Clermont City Council on October 27, 2026. He related that staff would move forward with reviewing the item with the Planning and Zoning Board as advertised, and that they would follow up with the BCC regarding the decision that the City Council made about the annexation. He mentioned that the annexation they were proposing was for a residential multifamily development with up to 317 residential units.

Commr. Parks commented that this had come before the BCC several times over the prior two years, and opined that the Board should not oppose the annexation into the City of Clermont. He opined that this area was very urban, and that it should be in the City of Clermont. He opined that there should be some mixed use involved with this project; however, the Clermont City Council would have the chance to decide that when they had the annexation hearing and the hearing for the site plan approval if it got that far.

Commr. Smith inquired if the Clermont City Council had already denied it before.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that the City of Clermont denied it once.

Commr. Campione opined that it could have been a different concept plan.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that it was the same property with the same elevation, water, and sewer issues.

Commr. Morris asked if the County would still go through with a hearing.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that they would still proceed with the Planning and Zoning Board hearing because that preceded the date of the Clermont City Council meeting, and that if the City Council denied it, then the County would proceed with the BCC hearing as well.

Commr. Parks mentioned that even though it was 12 units per acre, it was in an appropriate place for that, and opined that it was a difficult subject because of the density. He opined that since there was a demand for housing, this was the most appropriate place for it, and that some mixed use would reduce trips, which would be for the City to decide.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that if the property was rezoned to Regional Office in a commercial use, they could come in under the Live Local Act and get multifamily housing which the County could not deny, and opined that this was something that both Boards needed to take under consideration.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: REZONING

REZONING CONSENT AGENDA

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

Mr. Fitzgerald displayed the advertisements for that day's rezoning cases on the overhead monitor in accordance with the Florida Statutes, and stated that there were 15 items on the current day's agenda. He mentioned that Tab 8 had been withdrawn; however, it had to be included on the agenda because it was an advertised item.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Rezoning Consent Agenda, Tabs 1 through 2, as follows:

Tab 1. Ordinance No. 2026-44
Rezoning Case # PZ2026-149
Astor Self Storage (RZ)
Rezone approximately 4.33 +/- acres from Mixed Residential (R-7) District and Light Industrial (LM) District to Light Industrial (LM) District to facilitate the expansion of a recently approved self-storage facility.

Tab 2. Ordinance No. 2026-45
Rezoning Case # PZ2026-155
Ady's Marketplace LLC (RZ)
Amend Planned Commercial (CP) District by Ordinance #2020-51 to revise the approved land uses to include golf cart retail sales.

REZONING REGULAR AGENDA

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 and 5. Ordinances No. 2026-46 and 2026-47
Rezoning Case # PZ2026-188
Voitik Property (FLUM & RZ)
1. Amend the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) of approximately 4.45 +/- acres from Wekiva River Protection Area A-1-20 Sending Area Future Land Use Category (FLUC) to Planned Unit Development Future Land Use Category to accommodate a single-lot residential subdivision.
2. Rezone approximately 4.45 +/- acres from Agriculture (A) District to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to accommodate a single-lot residential subdivision.

Tab 6. Ordinance No. 2026-48
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-274
Sunshower Estates PUD (RZ)
Rezone approximately 19.68 +/- gross acres (approximately 19.03 +/- net acres) from Agriculture (A) District to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to accommodate a 57-lot residential subdivision.

Tab 7.
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-83
Tiger Paw Estates PUD (RZ)
Amend Skiing Paradise/Swiss Fairways Planned Unit Development Ordinance No. 2018-6 to revise the approved land uses by replacing the 18 duplex villas (36 dwelling units) and 30 vacation suites (comprised of 10 triplex buildings) with 25 single-family residential units, in order to facilitate and incorporate the Tiger Paw residential development.

Tab 9. Final Development Order No. 2026-9
Variance Case # PZ2025-375
Escobedo Property (VAR)
A variance to Land Development Regulations (LDR) Section 14.11.01(D)(2)(c), entitled Standards, to allow the creation of two (2) lots through the minor lot split process where the easement that leads to the parent parcel varies in width and is 10 feet wide at the narrowest point in lieu of the required 50 feet.

Tab 10. Final Development Order No. 2026-10
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.

Tab 11. Final Development Order No. 2026-11
Variance Case # PZ2026-160
Sorrento Hills – Heartland Dental (VAR)
A variance to Land Development Regulations (LDR) Section 9.01.07 (A)(1), entitled Internal Landscaping in Parking Areas and other Site Areas, other than Single-Family and Duplex Lots, to allow the construction of one (1) parking area landscape island nine (9) feet wide and 163 square feet, and one parking area landscape island nine (9) feet wide and 176 square feet in lieu of the required minimum width of twelve (12) feet and minimum pervious area of the three hundred (300) square feet required for internal landscaping in parking areas.

Tab 12. Final Development Order No. 2026-12

Variance Case # PZ2026-194
Bella Collina 359E Property (VAR)
A variance to Land Development Regulations (LDR) Section 9.02.12, entitled Heritage Trees, to allow the removal of two (2) heritage trees to facilitate the construction of a single-family residence.

Tab 13. Final Development Order No. 2026-13
Variance Case # PZ2026-144
Gore Property (VAR)
A variance to Land Development Regulations (LDR) Table 3.02.05, entitled Setbacks Requirements, to allow an after-the-fact accessory structure (carport) to be located nine (9) feet from the western property line in lieu of the required ten (10) feet.

Tab 14. Final Development Order No. 2026-14
Variance Case # PZ2026-109
Lebron Quiles Property (VAR)
A variance to Land Development Regulations (LDR) Table 3.02.05 to allow an unpermitted accessory structure (carport) to remain 4.5 feet from the right-of-way, in lieu of the required 25 feet.

Tab 15. Final Development Order No. 2026-15
Variance Case # PZ2026-191
Miller & Cobb Property (VAR)
A variance to Land Development Regulations (LDR) Section 6.01.04(A)(1) to allow for the development of an accessory structure (screen room over existing concrete) to be located 46-feet from the ordinary high water line, mean high water line, or jurisdictional wetland line, whichever is further landward, in lieu of the required 50-feet.

CHURCH OF GOD CAMPGROUND (RZ)

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that Rezoning Case # PZ2026-36, Church of God Campground (RZ), was to amend PUD Ordinance 2014-5 to revise the land uses to include Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) uses and increase the total number of recreational vehicle (RV) sites, allowing a total of twenty-nine (29) permanent RV sites, and that the Planning and Zoning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of this item. He mentioned that this item came before the BCC on September 1, 2026; however, because of concerns about the existing package plant, the Board voted to table the project to the current day to give the applicant additional time to review enhanced options and return with the applicant's engineer.

Commr. Campione inquired if there were ex parte communications on this case.

Commr. Parks commented that he spoke with the applicant.

Commr. Smith mentioned that even though he set up two meetings with the applicant, neither one came to fruition.

Mr. John Stockham, a consultant representing the applicant, introduced Pastor Demetris Presley, with the Church of God, and Mr. Daniel Magro, with Aclus Engineering, speaking via Zoom, who was working on the wastewater treatment system. He opined that they were in a position to request approval of this amendment to allow the RV sites to continue and to allow for the neighborhood commercial uses to be added, and noted that if the wastewater system currently on the site could not be rebuilt pursuant to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) requirements, then the owner would be obligated to rebuild the treatment system on the larger side of the two parcels in order to meet the FDEP requirements. He displayed a map, and

explained that they currently had the treatment system to the west of CR 473, which was where the RV sites were located. He remarked that if the system failed and FDEP required that it be moved to the larger parcel east of CR 473, then this was where it would be placed based on setbacks and other requirements. He added that according to page six of the new ordinance under utilities, it said that the subject property may continue to be serviced by the existing septic until such time as the development rendered a flow of at least 100,000 gallons per day, the septic system reached end of life and required replacement, or public service became available in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) and Land Development Regulations (LDR) as amended, noting that if the existing septic system reached end of life and required replacement prior to public sewer becoming available, then the system shall be replaced with a Distributed Wastewater Treatment System (DWTS) or an enhanced system. He opined that this ordinance would be enough to protect the County, as a tailored zoning for this site, noting that they were requesting that they could have a total of 29 RV sites and that the northwest corner be a site for neighborhood commercial uses.

Commr. Morris questioned how the commercial use on the northwest would be serviced for wastewater.

Mr. Stockham related that according to page six of the ordinance, any portion of an onsite septic system shall be set back 100 feet from the wetland jurisdiction line in accordance with the Comp Plan, and said that this was added to the ordinance for the northwest corner. He pointed out the wetland area on the aerial photo, and said that any commercial grade septic system or advanced system would have to be set back 100 feet from the wetland area to serve any neighborhood commercial.

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that there were issues with the existing treatment plant, and asked if those had been fixed.

Mr. Stockham answered that the owner and the engineer had been working with FDEP on the upgrades and the permitting; however, this hearing was more about the uses. He remarked that if the system failed or reached 100,000 gallons per day, then it would be required to be replaced, and opined that any permitting with FDEP was separate from this process.

Commr. Morris opined that the Board should wait for it.

Mr. Stockham stated that it was at the Board's discretion, and opined that this ordinance was the best agreement available for this proposal.

Commr. Morris expressed concern about the residents living behind this area, and wanted to ensure that the wastewater treatment plant was working in accordance to FDEP, opining that it was not currently.

Pastor Presley commented that it was working to standard currently, and that there was an updated permit being done. He mentioned that they were not meeting the maximum level, and that even though there were peak seasons for summertime recreation, they had a process that continued to keep it in flow within reason. He relayed that there were some complaints about a couple of isolated incidents that had been addressed with proper procedures that had been put in place to manage this moving forward, and that it was working.

Mr. Magro confirmed this, and stated that they were working through the FDEP to address some of their concerns and the issues that were identified in the past. He remarked that even though this effort had not been completed yet, the plant was currently meeting the effluent requirements and was under its permitted capacity.

Commr. Campione inquired what the issues were, and noted that she had heard complaints from people in that area. She mentioned that driving by this area, she could not believe that this was a sewage package plant, opining that it did not look like it was in good shape.

Mr. Magro commented that there was a variety of issues, and that one of the largest issues that needed to be resolved was related to the drain field. He elaborated that it needed attention and needed to be replaced for it to work properly, and that since it was below ground, it was nothing that could be seen. He related that there were other mechanical components that needed to be fixed, and that FDEP had raised issues with the pump station on the eastern property, which was farther from the residents, noting that there were some items that needed to be repaired there.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they were under their volume numbers and could continue to use this sewage treatment facility; however, there were issues that needed to be fixed. She asked if those issues should be fixed now as opposed to later.

Pastor Presley replied that those issues were being addressed, and that they had already made a majority of those improvements, noting that they were currently working on the drain field, which was a larger item. He mentioned that they had received several inspections to look at it to start the process of repairing it, and that they were working with FDEP to see what they would accept. He commented that even though this was an older site, they were working to improve those issues, and that they were requesting the amendment to the PUD to prepare them as they moved forward.

Commr. Parks questioned if the issue and the complaints were related to odor, and if there were issues with the effluent and the quality of it; furthermore, he expressed concerns about the drain field.

Pastor Presley mentioned that he was there frequently, and that there was no consistent odor there, noting that there was an isolated incident which had been addressed. He explained that they had to replace their operator, and that with their current operator there had been no issues with odors. He commented that they had repaired the portion of the mechanical side, and that they were working on the drain field next so that they could meet the FDEP requirements and would not be a nuisance or an issue for the community.

Commr. Morris inquired how long it would be for the drain field to be replaced.

Pastor Presley answered that once they received the approval from FDEP, they would start work on it. He remarked that he communicated to his council that this had to be a top priority, and that the PUD approval would help them to address all those things. He related that they had started conversations with the City of Leesburg in regards to going on their sewer system, which was their goal, opining that this was a two to three year process; however, the current site was working.

Commr. Morris asked if the City of Leesburg had the ability to provide sewer, and wondered why they could not use that.

Pastor Presley mentioned that even though they were about 2,500 feet away from the nearest sewer line, this was what they were looking to do.

Commr. Parks questioned if they were seeking a pioneering agreement, opining that 2,500 feet was a long way.

Pastor Presley stated that this was why their team was meeting with them currently to discuss how to work this out.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Mark Dayton, a resident on the corner of County Road (CR) 473 and Camp Street, indicated concerns about the traffic, and relayed that even though he used to go to the Church of God, things had changed through the years. He opined that he and his neighbors were being crowded out, and that there were plenty of other retirement communities around CR 473 that were nicer, noting that he objected to this.

Commr. Campione inquired if his main objection was about the proposed commercial part as opposed to the additional RV sites.

Mr. Dayton replied that the applicant already had places that they rented out that were like little cottages, and that they were concerned about the construction that would be going on across the road from them.

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

Commr. Smith expressed concerns about the current sewer package plant. He relayed his understanding that they were working on it to where it was functional, and that if sewer became available and their package plant exceeded its limit, they had to go to the City of Leesburg; however, the City of Leesburg had written a letter saying that they would not accept wastewater from the RV park. He opined that even though Pastor Presley said that it may take two to three years to hook up to the City's central line, they would not spend this funding to revamp the package plant and then move into the City of Leesburg's sewer. He expressed concern about the traffic, and opined that the property was in a state of disrepair, noting that he would like to see some of these issues corrected before any rezoning was passed.

Commr. Parks mentioned that according to a news article, there were about 27 churches closing per day in the U.S., and opined that this church was trying to fix things up. He indicated his understanding that they were going from 23 to 29 units, and opined that a little bit of commercial was good as it reduced trip travel. He expressed concern about the sewer utility issue, and said that this was the only way the Board had to protect water resources; however, he opined they their full intent was to fix things.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that the City of Leesburg would never accept wastewater from an RV park, and opined that even though the owner was trying to make funding so they could get what they needed done, it was a case of putting the cart before the horse.

Commr. Campione commented that she was in favor of trying to help the church, opining that the property could be developed or have different ownership. She opined that even though they were fixing it up, there could still be a couple of years of the package plant not working well,

complaints, and lingering issues; however, she opined that if they had an end user for the commercial aspect, they could look at improvements that they were willing to make with the traffic at the intersection there, opining that this was just speculative.

Commr. Smith asked how long it would be before the package plant came up to standard or there was a DWTS.

Pastor Presley stated that they were currently obtaining quotes to proceed with that option, and opined that it would be about three to six months.

Commr. Smith related that he was uncomfortable with approving this item without knowing that this was corrected, and he suggested tabling this item until they were 100 percent compliant.

Pastor Presley indicated his understanding that these were the main points that they could move forward on. He commented that they used this site mostly for recreation, summer camps, and the church's needs, which was their main focus, and that some of the commercial things were for the growth and progress of the site.

Commr. Smith asked if Pastor Presley wanted to postpone this item.

Pastor Presley opined that this would be in their best interest.

Commr. Morris wondered if they should withdraw the application.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that they could postpone it indefinitely, and that they could just readvertise, noting that they could keep the project file open for them while they addressed the concerns. He pointed out that Ordinance 2014-5 only allowed 23 RV spaces, and that only 18 of those spaces were allowed west of CR 473, noting that the other RVs were supposed to have been removed by December 31, 2023. He related that since those RVs had not been removed, staff was requesting direction from the Board in regards to the removal of those RVs while the applicant was addressing the concerns.

Commr. Smith questioned if the wastewater treatment plant was operational for those RVs.

Pastor Presley reiterated that even though there were some improvements that had been required by the FDEP for permitting and Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) requirements, it was currently operational.

Commr. Smith asked why the Church of God did not remove those units in time.

Pastor Presley replied that this happened under a different administration, and that it created a code enforcement case. He remarked that because they wanted to continue the service of RVs, they asked for the amendment to continue this.

Commr. Parks inquired how many RVs there were currently.

Pastor Presley answered that there were about 18 sites in use currently.

Commr. Smith asked if they were permanent residents.

Pastor Presley replied that four were, and that the others came and went.

Commr. Parks opined that it would take three to four months to get this worked out, and wondered if staff would have them remove the RVs.

Mr. Fitzgerald questioned if staff should proceed with the code enforcement case, or if it should be paused while the applicant worked on the site.

Commr. Campione suggested pausing it for six months.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, commented that there could not be an indefinite postponement because it was a violation of the County code, and that if the Board wanted to give them six months, then they could abate the code case for that time period. She remarked that if they did not come back or fix the system to where they could come back and have this approved, then they would have to proceed at some point with the code case, noting that the RVs would then have to be removed.

Commr. Smith opined that there could be a motion of postponing this until June 2027 while keeping the RVs there, and that if nothing had been fixed by that time, then the County could move forward with the removal of the RVs and the cancellation of this request.

Commr. Morris asked if the code case could be paused.

Commr. Smith confirmed this, and said that this would be for six months to see if they could fix the package plant.

Ms. Marsh clarified that the Board could table this item until June 1, 2027, and that either they would be ready to proceed or they would be removing the RVs.

Pastor Presley questioned if they would be able to come back prior to that.

Ms. Marsh answered that they could, and that they would just have to advertise again, noting that there would be advertising costs.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board tabled this item to June 1, 2027 or sooner if they were ready to proceed or to remove the RVs.

VOITIK PROPERTY (FLUM & RZ)

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that Tabs 4 and 5 for Rezoning Case # PZ2026-188, the Voitik Property (FLUM & RZ), were companion ordinances that would be presented together, and that the requested action was to amend the FLU map of approximately 4.45 acres from the Wekiva River Protection Area (WRPA) A-1-20 to PUD to accommodate a single-lot development for a residential home. He remarked that they were also proposing a rezoning of approximately 4.45 acres from Agriculture to PUD to accommodate the home, and that the Planning and Zoning Board recommended that the BCC would consider denial of this item. He related that the location was on Huff Road in the City of Eustis area, and that the concept plan depicted a proposed single family dwelling unit, a proposed accessory structure, and a concrete pad. He mentioned that on March 3, 2003, Lake County staff approved a family density exception lot split, and that on April 3, 2006, County staff executed and recorded a revocation of that 2003 lot split, releasing the land from all deed restrictions related to the family density exception and returning it for zoning and building purposes to a single parcel. He relayed that in 2025, the previous owner sold one of the separate parcels under the family density exception to the current owners, and that staff was requesting consideration for a PUD to accommodate a Lake County resident that purchased a piece of property where there was once a family density exception which was revoked. He commented that this was not for a family member as it was for private citizens, and opined that this was the best course of action.

Commr. Campione inquired if there was any ex parte communication on this case, and mentioned that she spoke with Ms. Meredith Nagel, an attorney representing the applicants.

Commr. Smith commented that he had a conversation with the same person as well as the builder.

Commr. Parks related that he had conversations with the applicant and the builder.

Commr. Morris remarked that he had a conservation with Mr. Adam Edgington, the builder.

Commr. Campione recalled that there was a similar land use change and rezoning in the Lake Norris area where there were two homes on one parcel in the WRPA, and that the only way to make it conform was to do a PUD.

Ms. Marsh elaborated that in 2023, there was a property off CR 44A in the WRPA A-1-20 receiving area that was zoned commercial, and that the property history indicated that it could have been used for residential. She commented that the property owner bought the existing structure, which was residential, and was attempting to add some accessory structures when they were told that it was commercial property. She said that they fixed it by putting them in the PUD FLU and zoning, which was a very defined development program, and that they were allowed to have two single family dwelling units and a commercial building as there were three separate properties that were part of that issue.

Commr. Campione wondered how many family density exceptions there were in the WRPA.

Mr. Fitzgerald related that there were 36 family density exceptions that were approved over the course of about 20 years in the WRPA.

Commr. Campione inquired if they knew if they had agriculture exemptions or if houses were built on them.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that staff could research that and follow up with the Board.

Commr. Campione commented that she would like to have something come out of this, such as a database or a record so that the County would know if those were still going to be homesites, and opined that 36 was not a large number compared to how large the WRPA was. She expressed concern about similar situations to this item where somebody bought a lot not knowing that the lot split had been administratively revoked.

Commr. Morris asked about the rest of the county, opining that there were many parcels that were possibly for sale or had sold that could have a lot split.

Commr. Campione relayed that in the rest of the county, it could be fixed in a different way than in the WRPA.

Commr. Parks opined that there were many issues with family lot splits.

Commr. Campione stated that she wanted to focus on the WRPA aspect, and noted that there were not many units that this could happen to, as there were only 36 potential lots that may already have houses on them.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that regarding similar situations, there was a chart that showed similar development in the area, and that even though this development took place in the years

between 1965 and 1990, these were examples of parcels located in the vicinity of the subject property that were similar in size and had homes on them.

Commr. Campione opined that his was helpful because it showed a pattern of development already established before the Wekiva Protection Act went into effect in 1988 or after, and noted that this was not a property next to the Wekiva River.

Mr. Fitzgerald mentioned that this pattern preceded the County Comp Plan where it became one unit per 20 acres in that area.

Mr. George Bloder, an attorney representing the applicant, commented that in 2003, the County created the lot in question through a family lot split for the previous owner, and that the property was divided into four separate tracts, noting that the other three tracts had homes on them. He related that in 2006, the lot split was revoked for failure to timely build on the property; however, despite that revocation, the Lake County Property Appraiser and Tax Collector continued to recognize the lot. He remarked that in 2025 the Voitiks bought this property through an online seller to build their dream home, noting that they raised funds for schools across Central Florida. He commented that when they began the permitting process with Trilogy Homes, their builder, their staff contacted the County to ensure that a separate building could be built on the lot, and that through emails sent back and forth regarding setbacks, they determined that a house could be built. He opined that there was much confusion about this piece of property, and said that it was only in the exploration of getting a density variance that they found that the lot was not buildable in January 2026. He stated that given this unique situation of the lot and its location in the WRPA A-1-20 sending area, the County advised that the PUD application was the only practical route, and that after reviewing the application, building plans, and supporting studies, staff found the request consistent with the Comp Plan, the LDR, and every applicable WRPA policy. He relayed that the property contained no wetland or sensitive ecological areas, and that all the structures would be built outside of the flood hazard area; additionally, the project protected the aquifer and native vegetation by using millings for the driveway instead of pavement and by keeping development away from the flood zone, especially at the east end of the property. He mentioned that since central sewer was not available in this location, the staff required an advanced treatment septic system to protect the groundwater, which the Voitiks agreed to, and that staff confirmed that the request was well within the density limits of the WRPA and preserved at least 50 percent open space as required, noting that it would only generate a one peak hour trip in rush hour, which was minimal. He opined that the request was not more impactful to the natural environment than the current development pattern, and noted that there were residential properties surrounding this lot. He commented that Thompson Environmental Consulting surveyed 100 percent of the property, and that the findings included the following: there were no wetlands or surface water, no wetland soils, and no wetland vegetation; all the protected species within the WRPA were not found to be on the property and would not be affected; there were potentially occupied gopher tortoise burrows, which were already protected on site by a 25 foot buffer, noting that any within those burrows would be relocated in accordance to Florida law; there would be a formal survey within 90 days before any clearing of those burrows; there was no habitat for the Florida scrub jay

or woodpeckers; since there were no wetlands, the potential for wetland birds, such as the protected species within the WRPA, were extremely low; the property was not suitable habitat for the sand skink; indigo snakes were not present on the property; the nearest documented bald eagle nest was about three miles away; 95 percent of the lot was well drained sand with the water table being more than 80 inches below the surface across the property, which was ideal for a home and a septic system; the site plan placed the home nearly 500 feet back from Huff Road on the property's high ground and nearly 700 feet from the small flood zone at the east end; and the buildings and concrete would cover just 4.4 percent of the lot. He relayed that the WRPA did not preclude what they were seeking, as the requirements of the Wekiva River Protection Act directed the County to protect water quality, wetland, wildlife, native vegetation, and the rural character of the area, while prohibiting development that was not low density in nature, noting that a single home on 4.5 acres was low density residential. He mentioned that staff applied the WRPA policies and found the request consistent with every one of them, and that the highest density allowed in the WRPA was 5.5 homes per acre, while they were asking only for one home on 4.5 acres. He commented that the family lot split came 15 years after the WRPA was created in 1988, opining that this meant that the County found that the character of this lot was consistent, noting that their request would bring the lot into conformity with the residential lots surrounding it. He showed photos of the residential properties within that area, and opined that they were all similar in character. He commented that there were not any other remedies for this issue, as the owners signed as is and hold harmless clauses, and that even if a lawsuit was possible, it would not bring them any closer to building their home there. He remarked that the Voitiks did their due diligence, including looking at the Lake County Tax Collector and Property Appraiser websites, and opined that even though there was an exception on their title commitment, it was very vague and misnamed, noting that since the Voitiks were not represented by a realtor or an attorney, they did not understand what that meant. He related that one concern from the Planning and Zoning Board meeting was that if the BCC approved this applicant, then it could set a precedence for others; however, he opined that the PUD application gave the County much scrutiny over these applications. He concluded that the Voitiks' house was small, that the impact was minimal, and that they had taken on substantial financial hardship to get this done.

Commr. Morris questioned if the title policy picked up the exception.

Mr. Bloder answered that it technically did; however, it was misnamed as a notice of filing in the exceptions section. He stated that since they were not represented by a realtor or an attorney, they did not notice it, noting that he was surprised that it did not stand out more.

Commr. Morris asked who sold them the property, who closed on the property, and who wrote the title policy.

Mr. Bloder relayed his understanding that the Watkins sold them the land through an online lot seller, and that he did not recall who closed the property or who wrote the title policy.

Mr. Mark Voitik, the property owner, commented that he and his wife had been living in Seminole County, and that in 2025 they decided to buy land and build a home, noting that they found the property in March 2025 and closed on October 30, 2025. H said that they were ready to

start building in March 2026, and that they followed the rules and paid numerous application fees in excess of over $40,000. He remarked that there were other homes where the property was located, and that their 4.5 acres was in the middle of them. He related that they just wanted to build their dream home, and opined that it would match all the homes that were in this area. He hoped that they could start this process soon, and indicated appreciation for the Board.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Newton opined that there was no environmental issue with the house; however, she expressed concern about the process, and opined that approving a PUD in the A-1-20 sending area could open the door for more PUDs in this area. She asked the Board to consider the direct impact on a local landowner who recently won his legal battle regarding his transfer of development rights (TDR), and opined that approving this application would devalue those TDRs and could potentially destroy the integrity of the entire TDR program. She explained that the TDR program functioned as a closed economic market where developers could secure density increases in the receiving area, and that this density was not allowed in the sending area. She asked the Board to deny this application, and opined that another way should be found for these people to build their house if possible.

Mr. Emery asked the Board to deny this application, and opined that there was another remedy for the applicant. He commented that this house was proposed in the one unit per 20 acre sending area, which was different from the case mentioned earlier that was in the receiving area, and opined that the applicant could buy some TDRs and use those credits to increase the density. He opined that this would be in the spirit of the WRPA and within the rules, and that the Board should do everything they could to protect the TDR marketplace, which was a compromise that was established when the WRPA was put in place. He opined that looking at the neighborhood and wanting to continue to build like that was not right, and that the sending area and the value of that designation should be protected.

Mr. Edgington opined that the Voiteks were great clients, and said that he would like to build a house for them. He opined that the applicants were the type of citizens that they would like, and noted that they had looked at all the possible options for building their house. He opined that this was the only process, which allowed for the most scrutiny, and that this would not set a precedent.

Ms. Barbara Morris, a resident of Commission District 4 speaking via Zoom, remarked that she was there during the Wekiva River Protection Act hearings, and that she owned a house on Huff Road. She recalled the examples given of the A-1-20 and A-1-40 sending areas, and noted that if the property was one square foot shy of the required area, then it would be denied. She opined that people in the WRPA had to live with that, and that approving this application would open the door from a family density exception to a simple density exception, which would set a precedent. She indicated her understanding that staff recommended denial, and opined that the process was being used incorrectly.

Commr. Campione clarified that staff was recommending approval, and that it was the Planning and Zoning Board that voted 4-2 to deny it.

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

Commr. Parks questioned if the applicant was notified by staff about a TDR option.

Mr. Bloder answered that they were told that the PUD process was the only option.

Commr. Campione pointed out that the property was in a sending area, and that TDRs could only be used in a receiving area.

Mr. Bloder opined that regarding the process, the PUD gave the County more control rather than just shifting density to meet requirement, and that this allowed the County to analyze the application. He opined that their application met every WRPA criteria to be approved, noting that this was what the staff report and their environmental and civil engineers had said. He opined that if this was not the case, then the Planning and Zoning Board and the BCC would have the ability to deny it, and that this gave the County more power over this process and more protection for this area.

Commr. Campione commented that there was an email sent to the County asking about the setbacks for this property, and that the County replied with what the setbacks were, opining that this led them to believe that it corroborated what they had already learned from the Lake County Property Appraiser's Office and the Tax Collector's Office. She opined that the Board knew that this did not count because this was brought up often, and that even though there was a process where one could ask for a letter, a zoning clearance, or a determination, this was not widely known. She opined that if this property were in A-1-40, was closer to the river, or was in an area that was undeveloped, then she would look at it differently; however, she opined that there was a development pattern there, that it was reasonable, and that it was fair. She stated that the goal was to protect the WRPA and respect the integrity of the Wekiva River Protection Act, and that there were reports showing that they were staying away from the floodplain, that there was not a wetland area, that they were using an enhanced septic system, and that they were looking for endangered species. She opined that the application deserved to be reviewed with the total information as opposed to opening the door to other PUDs, which she opined it was not.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was a difficult vote to make, and said that he would vote no. He opined that even though this was an amazing family that had done great things in the community and had been dealt a bad deal, one of the oaths taken for this position was to stand by the law, and that this was the most protected and most scrutinized land in the county. He opined that even though the land was in an area where it would not cause any adverse effects to the environment around it, it was very scrutinized along with the Green Swamp, and that he did not want to increase the density in that area at all.

Commr. Parks opined that this was not increasing density in this area, and that even though this circumstance could possibly have been avoided, they were there currently. He opined that there was a pragmatic approach to this, and that the PUD requirements asked for a whole different level of documentation, including studies and reports, that was not required for the homeowners around this property. He opined that from a code enforcement standpoint, it would be easier to prosecute if they did something outside of the PUD, and that even though there were concerns

about spot zoning, which may be how it looked on paper, there was a use not far north of this location that was a congregate home with about 20 residents.

Mr. Fitzgerald clarified that this was a community home in Community Facility District (CFD) zoning.

Commr. Smith inquired if the PUD would take it from Agriculture and move it into residential.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that this was a two ordinance discussion, as it was a land use change from the WRPA to a PUD and a rezoning proposal from Agriculture to a PUD zoning.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that if the current owners decided to sell the property, someone could do a wedding venue out there, which he opined may be disruptive; however, they would not be allowed to do that under this ordinance.

Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed this, and commented that this would go to a PUD specifically designed for a residential home. He clarified that wedding venues required a CUP because they were converting an agricultural building into an assembly use, and that under the building code, this would be done with a CUP so they could move forward with a permit.

Commr. Smith commented that he was in favor of a one home per five acre PUD.

Commr. Campione opined that there was nothing in the current application that violated the Wekiva River Protection Act, and that if a home had been built when the lot split was originally done, then there would be a home there currently.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried by a vote of 4-1, the Board approved Tabs 4 and 5, Rezoning Case # PZ2026-188, Voitik Property (FLUM & RZ).

Commr. Sabatini voted no.

SUNSHOWER ESTATES PUD (RZ)

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that Rezoning Case # PZ2025-274, Sunshower Estates PUD (RZ), was to rezone approximately 19.68 gross acres from Agriculture to PUD to accommodate a 57-lot residential subdivision, and noted that the Planning and Zoning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval on the regular agenda. He mentioned that the location was on Rolling Acres Road in unincorporated Lake County, and that the conceptual plan depicted 57 residential lots with the maximum density of three dwelling units per one net acre with a minimum of a 65 foot lot width, noting that they would accommodate 25 percent open space. He pointed out that their current land use of Urban Low allowed up to four units per acre, and that they were proposing three units per acre. He remarked that the property was located within the Town of Lady Lake interlocal service boundary agreement (ISBA) area, and that the Town had made no comments in reference to the zoning; however, they provided a utility letter confirming that although utilities were in the vicinity of the subject property, capacity was not available at this time. He related that the Office of Parks and Trails had commented that the future Gardenia Trail would go in this area; however, the exact location had not been determined at this time. He indicated that this property may be affected by the location of the trail, and that if the trail went on their side of the road, they would be required to consider some right of way dedication by the Public Works Department. He commented that Fire Station 52 was located 1.4 miles from the subject property, and that when the

transportation concurrency was reviewed, it was determined that there was no change in the level of service to the surrounding roadways. He remarked that the applicant would be required to submit a traffic study if they moved forward with subdivision construction, and that all sensitive resources would be addressed at the site plan development review.

Commr. Campione inquired if there were ex parte communications on this case.

Commr. Parks commented that he met with the applicant.

Commr. Smith indicated that he met with the applicant.

Commr. Morris said that he met with the applicant.

Commr. Parks asked if the right of way would be required from the homeowners association (HOA), opining that it may be an issue sometime in the future.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that developers must closely coordinate with the Public Works Department before any development application approval to ensure that there would be enough right of way for the trail construction if the property was affected by the future trail, noting that it would be determined by where the trail was going to go.

Mr. Craig Brazier, with NV5 and representing the applicant, stated that they had committed to provide additional right of way along the frontage to ensure that there was a least a minimum of 50 feet from the current centerline, and that behind this, there would be an additional roadway buffer which would provide additional space if needed. He commented that the underlying land use was not changing, and that what they were proposing was consistent with the underlying land use. He opined that the agricultural zoning was not compatible with the underlying land use, and that this would rectify that situation. He remarked that they explored a denser project at first; however, through coordination with staff, they reduced the number of proposed lots and made them larger to be more compatible with what the County desired and the development patterns in the area. He related that in addition to the right of way dedication, they would also be making some turn lane improvements on Rolling Acres Road; furthermore, there was currently an access easement that ran along the southern boundary of this property which would remain in use, as people used this to access their homes.

Commr. Campione remarked that in the ordinance the County required drought tolerant native vegetation for street trees, landscape buffers, etc., and she wondered if there was way to preserve the existing trees.

Mr. Brazier commented that where there were existing trees, they would try to save what they could, noting that since there was a cost to the removal of any regulated tree, there was a financial benefit to saving trees that were in place.

Commr. Campione stated that she did not know if there was a way to incorporate that, and opined that this was not typical with developers, as it was typical to raze everything and recontour the area; however, she opined that if there was a way to preserve the existing trees or if a commitment could be made, this would be positive.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that there was an ordinance that protected the trees.

Commr. Campione clarified that it protected heritage trees, and that this was stated in the ordinance, noting that unless a heritage tree was diseased, it could not be taken out.

Mr. Brazier relayed his understanding that there were also regulated trees for which there were mitigation fees to be paid or replanting required, and opined that it would be a benefit to commit to save any existing trees. He opined that this would add value to the property as well.

Commr. Parks pointed out that between where the lots ended and the road, there was a buffer planned, and opined that language could be added to preserve every native tree as much as possible. He opined that engineers would want to grade the property and take the trees out, and that this might require retaining walls versus grading.

Mr. Brazier opined that this was a possibility, and mentioned that the site had not been engineered to that level. He commented that even though he did not want to overpromise, they would take every opportunity possible to save existing trees, and opined that along the frontage was one of the better places than some other areas where grading and fill may be more necessary because of the elevation, as it tended to go down as one went from east to west.

Commr. Morris inquired when they would start with development if this was approved.

Mr. Brazier related that they would still have to go through a preliminary plat, and that they were still at least 15 months out getting through the remainder of the process, noting that it would be up to the market at that time.

Commr. Morris questioned if the Board could include in the ordinance that the developer was required to hook up to the Town of Lady Lake sewer instead of DWTS if the Town had capacity by the time they started to develop.

Ms. Marsh replied that they could add that language.

Mr. Brazier indicated his understanding that this was addressed already in the ordinance on page five under utilities, and that they were aware of it, noting that their first attempt was to annex into the Town of Lady Lake. He mentioned that because they had other projects in the Town of Lady Lake, they understood some of the issues they were having with wastewater treatment plant capacity, and that they had those conversations.

Commr. Morris commented that he was in favor of the 65 foot lots.

Commr. Parks mentioned that this happened to be a place where 65 foot lots were good, and that he liked the open space and the commitment for DWTS, which was the highest level of nutrient treatment if they could not get onto sewer.

Mr. Brazier stated that the applicant wanted to do a nice project.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Newton remarked that since the Town of Lady Lake did not have capacity, she wanted to know if there would be 57 individual DWTS with 57 individual drain fields or a community drain field, and opined that even though a DWTS made sense when replacing a septic system because it decreased the nitrogen, it did not help reduce the phosphorus much. She commented that this particular BMAP had a phosphorus issue, and that if they were doing agricultural density, this would not be an issue; however, she opined that 57 DWTS with a community drain field would make a large difference. She indicated her understanding that some of the regulations would be

getting stricter on the BMAPs, and that for every one of these that was added in a new area that was not hooked up to sewer, nutrients would be added to the BMAP that would be required to be removed in some way. She opined that increasing density in this area by 1,400 percent was an issue for the BMAP.

Commr. Parks disagreed on the phosphorus, and relayed his understanding that the DWTS unit and other advanced wastewater treatment systems treated phosphorus, noting that this particular DWTS was 80 to 90 percent equal to a municipal sewer plant. He opined that it would be ideal if everyone could be on sewer; however, this was not always an option.

Commr. Smith wondered if there could be an addition to the requirement to request sewer, and noted that the letter from the Town of Lady Lake said that there should be capacity by 2029 or 2030. He opined that they should be allowed to build; however, if they had not come up with a final plat by that time, then they must hook up to the Town's water and sewer.

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

Mr. Brazier relayed that the DWTS would be installed by a licensed contractor as well as being reviewed and permitted by FDEP, and that they would agree with this additional language.

Commr. Sabatini mentioned that this was agriculturally zoned land, and that the Comp Plan allowed for potentially higher uses of residential density; however, he opined that the trend was to immediately upzone the property. He recalled that he had instructed the County Attorney's Office to send a memo at a previous BCC meeting explaining the legal dynamic, and opined that agricultural land served a public purpose. He opined that the staff report was sufficient evidence for keeping land agricultural, and that even though not every piece of land zoned agriculture should stay that way forever, most should. He opined that it was short term thinking for the future of Lake County to think that since nobody was farming the agricultural land currently, it should be turned into housing, and that if the Board was making a decision for the County for 200 years in the future, then that transfer of zoning was a disservice to the people who would be living there in future generations. He stated that he was against this rezoning, opining that the current agriculture zoning was a good thing even if nobody was going to open a farm in the near future. He opined that because of poor decision making in the City of Tallahassee and at the Federal level, there was a bad market for agriculture in the state and in the country, and that this had artificially incentivized other parts of the economy, including construction, real estate, etc. He opined that this would lead to a dead end, and that eventually there would be a form of economy in the county that could not sustain itself long term. He opined that the Board should be more careful about the rezonings, and said that he would be voting no.

Commr. Campione opined that unless there was substantial competent evidence on the record that supported this, then the County was not meeting the burden.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was explained in the memo.

Commr. Campione stated that as a general rule, the Board would honor the Comp Plan because it established what the FLUs were, and that when there was a zoning that was not consistent with the Comp Plan, the burden shifted. She elaborated that the Comp Plan said that

this should be urban, as it was surrounded by urban uses and in an urban area, and that if the Town of Lady Lake had the capacity, it would be providing water and sewer, noting that the County had a condition that required it to be serviced by them if there was capacity. She commented that if this was a rural land use and had an agriculture zoning, then this would be a different scenario and a different burden; however, because this had an urban land use and they were requesting a zoning that matched the urban land use and explained why, the only way the County could legally deny this was to have substantial and competent evidence explaining why it should be denied.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was legally incorrect, and that this could be dealt with at a future BCC meeting for the sake of time, noting that he would read the memo along with case law.

Commr. Campione opined that the memo supported what she just said.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this argument would necessitate the elimination of all agricultural land that was in any part of the Comp Plan other than currently zoned agricultural rural areas, and that this was not true. He opined that agriculture was an allowed land use in many of the other elements and parts of the Comp Plan, including on this property, which was allowed to stay as agriculture. He opined that the staff report and the Comp Plan showed that keeping agricultural land uses throughout the county served a public interest, and that there did not have to be witnesses for this.

Commr. Campione related that the County encouraged agricultural remaining agricultural, and that this was why it was an allowable use throughout the county even if they were surrounded by property that was inconsistent with this use; however, this was a different scenario than a landowner asking to make a change, opining that the County would not make them continue agriculture zoning if they could meet the burden of showing that they met the Comp Plan requirements. She mentioned that there were many rural designated areas on the FLU map that had agriculture zoning on them, and opined that they were in a different category than an urban land use.

Commr. Parks commented that there were many allowable uses within agriculture and in this land use category, and opined that the memo was correct in that there had to be a reason why one was denying it. He elaborated that he did not support a zoning case from the previous year on 40 acres off Lakeshore Drive, and that he wrote his reasons for denial using the basis of the review process that was in the code, which the applicant's attorney used when challenging the Board's decision. He opined that it was risky for the Board to deny an application because they did not like it, and noted that even though he understood the concerns about the loss of agricultural lands, which the current property was not, the reasons needed to be supportable.

Commr. Campione remarked that in this case, the reasons cited were used as the basis of the County defending its position when sued, and that there were people who testified in support of the reasons on the record, opining that the County did everything by the book. She opined that even though the Board liked the idea of agricultural property staying agricultural forever, the rules had to be followed.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried by a vote of 4-1, the Board approved Tab 6, Rezoning Case # PZ2025-274, Sunshower Estates PUD (RZ).

Commr. Sabatini voted no.

TIGER PAW ESTATES PUD (RZ)

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that Rezoning Case # PZ2025-83, Tiger Paw Estates PUD (RZ), was to amend the Skiing Paradise Swiss Fairways PUD Ordinance 2018-6 to revise the approved land uses by replacing 18 duplex villas and 30 vacation suites with 25 single-family residential units to facilitate the Tiger Paw residential development. He mentioned that when the Planning and Zoning Board reviewed this item, they unanimously recommended approval, and that it was located on CR 565A. He recalled that this item came before the Board on July 14, 2026, and that it was reviewed and tabled until the current day to give the property owners an opportunity to decide among themselves what their property rights were. He commented that the development was comprised of the following: it was about 406.8 acres; the conceptual plan had 25 single family residential lots; the subject parcels were 47.8 net acres; minimum lot size would be 30,000 square feet; the typical lot size would be about 120 feet by 250 feet; the open space would be 60.6 percent, which was in compliance with the ordinance; it was located within the City of Groveland ISBA, who provided no comments when the application was submitted to them; the development would be serviced by individual private wells and DWTS; and Lake County Fire Station 95 was located 2.16 miles from the subject property.

Commr. Sabatini left the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Commr. Smith commented that he had no ex parte communications other than the previous ex parte on the record.

Commr. Morris said that he had no ex parte.

Commr. Parks indicated that he had no ex parte.

Mr. Michael Hirst, with Make Some Spray LLC and the applicant, remarked that they had submitted for the conversion of all units, which included 18 duplexes and 10 triplexes, to single family homes, and that they wanted to allocate the 29 residential units to give 25 units to Make Some Spray and four units to Swiss Fairways. He mentioned that at the previous BCC meeting, Swiss Fairways contested the ownership of the property by Make Some Spray, who was deeded the property by Clemson Skiers LLC, noting that Clemson Skiers purchased the property and construction plans from Swiss Fairways. He commented that in November 2017, Clemson Skiers LLC created phase one and two of the plans and renamed the project to Tiger Paw Estates, and that even though phase one was built, phase two was delayed because of litigation and the construction plans expired. He related that Make Some Spray was asking the BCC to vote for the conversion of the 10 triplexes and 18 duplexes into 29 single family homesites in the PUD, and that Make Some Spray had a settlement agreement with Swiss Fairways to receive no less than 21 of the 29 available units. He stated that Make Some Spray had done all the work and paid all the expenses with the County and with the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) to obtain this vote, and opined that the cost of this process was a burden for Make Some Spray and a benefit for Swiss Fairways because the units would already be converted to single family homes,

which they valued to be worth one to two additional lots to Make Some Spray. He commented that they had accepted the financial responsibility to construct a turn lane at the intersection of Montevista Road and Phillips Road, opining that the turn lane should have been constructed by Swiss Fairways during their development process. He remarked that Lake County would require this turn lane to be built prior to any more lots being built, and that the estimate for this turn lane in 2017 was about $500,000. He related that Make Some Spray had budgeted $750,000 in construction costs for this turn lane, which would benefit Swiss Fairways and all drivers on Montevista Road and Phillips Road, and that Make Some Spray valued this infrastructure at one to two lots, noting that this would give them 25 units with four units for Swiss Fairways. He opined that a vote against this project would negatively impact Swiss Fairways because their allotment would be 10 triplexes that must be designated as vacation rentals only, and that this would have a negative impact on the environment. He related that this would also give 18 duplexes or 36 units to Make Some Spray, which would mean more water consumption, more septic, and more traffic, and that Make Some Spray would move forward with the 18 duplexes and one single family home because of the investment already made into this project. He opined that in the future, Swiss Fairways would not be able to convert the 10 triplexes into single family homes because then the allocation would be 19 units to Make Some Spray and 10 units to Swiss Fairways, which would violate their settlement agreement. He mentioned that the owners of Make Some Spray were not developers, as they were residents of phase one, and that they wanted to be good stewards of the land and build a good community with lots of green space and community areas, including pickleball courts, basketball courts, a walking path, and gardens. He opined that phase one was a success, and said that they wanted to build on that success with phase two to show the world what made Lake County a great place to live.

Commr. Morris left the meeting at 11:05 a.m.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that there was a settlement agreement between Make Some Spray and Swiss Fairways, and questioned when it was done and what it meant.

Mr. Hirst replied that through litigation, they decided to settle instead of letting a jury decide, and that in the agreement, they agreed that Make Some Spray would receive 21 units, which was in 2023.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that they were able to build 18 duplexes currently.

Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed this, and elaborated that this would result in 36 dwelling units.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that according to the calculations, they were allowed to build 21 single family homes.

Mr. Fitzgerald clarified that according to the settlement agreement, they were given the rights to 21 units.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Alexandre De Nobrega Dos Santos, a resident of Lake County, commented that he owned land zoned commercial for condominiums for students for the waterskiing school, and expressed concerns about how this case affected his land.

Commr. Parks inquired if he had any relation to Ms. Katty Parent, a resident that he received an email from, and Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos said that he did. Commissioner Parks then asked Mr. Fitzgerald if this PUD amendment would affect Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos' property.

Mr. Fitzgerald indicated his understanding that there were 29 units available for development under the PUD, and that this was based on a conversion of the 36 dwelling units from the 18 duplex buildings and 30 vacation homes from the 10 triplexes. He commented that Tiger Paw Estates proposed to build 25 units, which would leave four units; however, he was not certain about Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos' property rights, as this was a private property matter between the owners in this PUD.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that they had something that was allocated internally from the PUD and what was approved before, and opined that this case should not affect what they already had existing.

Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed this, and stated that they did not analyze Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos' property or look to see what had been built already or what he had rights to, noting that this was new information to staff. He reiterated that there were 29 units available, and that whoever got them was a determination that the current day's decision would impact. He opined that this would not have any affect on any commercial rights, as this was for residential development, and that if there was a piece of property designated for commercial, then it would not be affected. He mentioned that if there was undeveloped property for residential, it had already been accounted for in the PUD, and that when staff went back to see where these units were initially located, the subject property clearly showed that the duplex units were on the subject property while the 30 vacation homes were being shown in a different area on the conceptual plan.

Commr. Parks opined that since there were different owners and different parts involved with the PUD, the County could not get involved with that.

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that he could not attest that any of what could potentially be allocated on the current day was part of Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos' property.

Commr. Campione questioned if what Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos had was already built.

Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos answered that he had some land that, according to the current PUD, he could just build some condominiums for students, and that his land had access to the lake and the school. He asked if these changes would affect his project for the future.

Ms. Marsh stated that according to geographic information systems (GIS), Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos and Ms. Parent owned property that had a single family residence on it, and that adjacent to this, there was some acreage that the Lake County Property Appraiser had classified as a camp, a one-story office, vacant, commercial, and wetland. She commented that if they wanted to develop this property with residential, then there were only so many units available under this PUD, and that if there was a dispute amongst people in the PUD as to who was entitled to the units, this would be a civil dispute that they would have solve somewhere else.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that as it currently stood, this would not affect what was already existing.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that there was the original owner of the PUD and another person who bought a portion of the PUD.

Ms. Marsh explained that this PUD predated the Comp Plan, and that it would never be approved under the current Green Swamp rules. She stated that Tiger Paw purchased a portion of the land, that there were single family homeowners in this PUD, and that Swiss Fairways owned some property there, noting that there was a multitude of owners under the PUD.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that there could be individual owners as long as they complied with the PUD.

Ms. Marsh confirmed this, and added that this was true as long as the overall PUD and what was developed did not exceed the original entitlements.

Commr. Smith inquired about what property Tiger Paw currently owned.

Mr. Fitzgerald answered that they currently owned about 47 acres of property, and that according to a map of the PUD, which was extensive, their property was in the center of it.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that all the other properties around it were not part of Tiger Paw.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that even though it was not part of Tiger Paw, it was part of Swiss Fairways.

Commr. Smith opined that this did not matter because Tiger Paw bought land to do whatever they wanted to do as long as they were compliant with the PUD, and asked what Tiger Paw actually purchased and what they were allowed to build that was only within their PUD.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that according to the original conceptual plan, they purchased property that was originally supposed to have a golf course and 18 duplex units, and that the property that had the vacation homes was owned by someone else. He stated that the conversion of the vacation homes and the rights to those units to be given to Tiger Paw was the question that caused the tabling of this item at a prior BCC meeting for the private property owners to decide among themselves who would get what, and that there were only so many units that were left to build. He recalled that Tiger Paw originally claimed all 29, and that they were currently claiming 25, noting that the Board had to hear from some other owners in the PUD.

Commr. Campione asked where Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos's property was.

Ms. Marsh answered that his property was adjacent to Summer Lake, and that one of the properties was in the name of Summer Spot LLC. She showed where the property was on the map, and noted that this was nowhere near Tiger Paw.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that since he was in the PUD, then whatever Tiger Paw took would affect Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos's property.

Ms. Marsh clarified that if Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos was seeking residential development in the future, then it would be because it was reaching the limit of residential units.

Commr. Campione inquired if Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos was planning to build residential units.

Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos replied that even though he was planning some development for his land, he could not tell exactly what that would be on the current day. He indicated concern about how his property and his future project would be affected.

Ms. Marsh asked if this property was in the area that was slated for the waterski dormitories.

Ms. Janie Barrón, Chief Planner for the Office of Planning and Zoning, replied that this was correct, and that based on a 2018 ordinance, there were waterski school dormitories, noting that this confirmed information staff received from Ms. Parent.

Ms. Marsh indicated her understanding that those parcels were not slated for residential development.

Commr. Campione commented that what was being done on the current day would not change the uses that were shown on Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos's property.

Commr. Smith questioned if the Board should let a judge tell them who owned what before the Board decided.

Ms. Marsh remarked that the request on the current day was to convert the duplexes and triplexes into single family units, and that if the Board agreed that this was an appropriate thing to do under the Comp Plan, then these units could be converted. She related that it was up to the property owners to potentially go to court over the units.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the 18 duplexes converted to 21 single family homes.

Mr. Fitzgerald clarified that the 18 duplex units would be converted to 18 single family units, and that according to the settlement agreement, they were entitled to no less than 21 units.

Commr. Campione commented that they were asking for 25 units, and that the Board had not heard from Mr. John Crocker, owner of Swiss Fairways Inc., opining that he would want some additional units.

Commr. Smith opined that this should be settled legally before coming to the Board.

Ms. Marsh stated that the Board could deny the request, and that if the Board did not feel that converting those units would meet the intent of the code, then the PUD could be left as it was.

Commr. Campione explained to Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos that he had uses on his property that would not be affected.

Mr. De Nobrega Dos Santos opined that he had beautiful land on the lake, and wondered if he could do something different there.

Commr. Campione remarked that he would have to submit an application showing what he currently had and what he would like to change, noting that this would be a completely different zoning case.

Mr. Crocker related that Tiger Paw was approved for 21 units, and that he had talked to both parties' engineers to come to a settlement. He commented that even though they had the same acreage, Tiger Paw was approved for 21 lots, and that he wanted eight units for five acre lots.

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

Mr. Hirst opined that it would be impossible to build eight single family homes on five acre lots when there was only one single family home left unless the Board voted to convert the residential use types, and that the only reason this vote was possible was because of Make Some Spray, as they had paid all the funds for the engineering, for the SJRWMD, and for the application. He opined that Mr. Crocker just wanted to put driveways off Redwing Road with no development costs and build single family homes that did not exist in the PUD until the Board voted for it.

Commr. Campione opined that if the Board did not vote for this on the current day, then the conversion would not happen.

Mr. Hirst commented that if the Board did not vote for this, then Make Some Spray would build two triplexes, 18 duplexes, and one single family home, which would be 43 units for Make Some Spray when they only wanted 25, leaving Swiss Fairways with eight triplex vacation homes.

Commr. Smith pointed out that staff converted 18 homes for the duplexes and 10 for the triplexes plus the one remaining home.

Mr. Hirst asked that they would be allowed their 21 units; otherwise, they would build the duplexes, two triplexes, and a single family home.

Commr. Parks opined that they would prefer the conversion.

Mr. Hirst agreed, and stated that he lived there and wanted to make it an amazing place that fit the area.

Commr. Smith inquired if Mr. Crocker would still be able to build his homes if the Board did nothing.

Ms. Marsh denied this, and said that all that was left was duplexes and triplexes. She commented that if the Board voted no on the current day, then the conversion would not happen, and that they could build the duplexes and triplexes on the property. She clarified that the Board would not be making any determination as to who got what of those units, and that they could go to court if they could not agree amongst themselves.

Mr. Hirst related that they did go to court, and that they had an agreement for 21 and eight single family homes. He opined that they could begin permitting 21 units, and that two would have to be triplexes with vacation homes.

Commr. Smith wondered if it could be put in the motion that Tiger Paw got 21 single family homes and Mr. Crocker got eight.

Ms. Marsh stated that she would not recommend doing this; however, they could submit this in their development plans.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the Board could convert it into 29 single family homes or not, and opined that they could fight it out.

Commr. Campione asked if Mr. Crocker had building permits issued.

Mr. Crocker answered that everything was submitted for his units, and that he had paid the fees. He mentioned that he had 40 acres in the Green Swamp area, and that there were houses on his street that were being built on less than five acres, as this was allowed in this area.

Commr. Smith remarked that he was trying to figure out what was the fairest solution.

Mr. Crocker reiterated that Tiger Paw was approved for 21 units, and that he just wanted eight lots, opining that Tiger Paw had not submitted anything to build triplexes or duplexes.

Commr. Parks questioned if Mr. Crocker had submitted anything.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that Mr. Crocker had applied for a presubmittal but not for a PUD amendment, and that they had looked at his plan and understood what his intention was. He clarified that if the ordinance was approved on the current day, there was a conceptual plan that showed Tiger Paw as having 25 units, and that they would have to establish the 21 units being dedicated to the Tiger Paw property through a conceptual plan.

Commr. Parks questioned if the Board could approve this without the concept plan.

Ms. Marsh commented that the Board could approve it being contingent upon this, and that the ordinance would not go into effect until the revised concept plan was attached if the Board wanted to do the 21 units.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the Board could approve 21 units contingent upon the concept plan being revised to show 21 units.

Ms. Marsh stated that they could add language saying that it would not become effective unless or until that new concept plan was attached.

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that this would be for 21 single family units, and that they could not mix and match duplexes unless the Board wanted to allow this.

Ms. Marsh related that if the Board wanted to only allow 21 single family units, then they would have to go in and fix the ordinance because there would still be some duplex and triplex rights left, and that the current conversion was for 29 units, noting that somebody else could apply to convert the others into single family units.

Commr. Campione opined that it would be easier to say that Mr. Crocker got eight units and that Tiger Paw could either do the 21 single family resident units or combine triplexes and duplexes, giving them that flexibility while ensuring that Mr. Crocker got his eight units.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that this could mean more units if Tiger Paw did not convert them into single family units.

Commr. Campione opined that the eight units could be pulled out of any conversion.

Commr. Smith questioned if these were the only two property owners that owned land with this issue.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they were the only ones affected by the unit count.

Commr. Smith said that he would not go against the County Attorney's advice, and that this meant not dividing the units.

Ms. Marsh clarified that she did not recommend the Board making the decision that one party was entitled to some units over the other, and that the Board should either approve to convert all the units to 29 single family residences and whoever submitted first would get them, or the Board could leave it as it was and let the two parties build their duplexes and triplexes. She suggested that if the Board wanted to assign a specific number to Tiger Paw, then they could only

change the single family residential to address Tiger Paw, and that they could leave some of the duplex and triplex units out so that anybody else who wanted to convert could submit for their own amendment to the PUD. She pointed out that the applicant was being required to build the turn lanes, and that if the Board was going to reduce the number and there were still units available, then it would have to be determined who was responsible for building the turn lanes.

Commr. Parks wondered if there was any benefit to pulling the concept/site plan and then having the site plan approval come back to the Board.

Mr. Fitzgerald recalled that this item was tabled on July 14, 2026 for this very reason, and that the owners of this PUD had not come to a private agreement and were forcing the Board to make a decision based on what private property rights were divided among the two parties. He mentioned that advice had been given by the County Attorney not to make a decision in that respect, opining that this item could be tabled again. He opined that the Board could request that these private property owners would get together and decide who had the rights to what units, and that they could come back with a clean proposal that they both agreed on.

Commr. Smith commented that he was more in favor of denying the application.

Ms. Marsh remarked that the Board could recommend denial without prejudice, which would allow them to bring it back without waiting one year.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that if this was denied, then they could go back to their original numbers.

Ms. Marsh confirmed this, and said that they could build duplexes and triplexes.

Commr. Parks stated that he was more inclined to have them try to work it out now.

Commr. Smith opined that there was nothing wrong with duplexes and triplexes.

Commr. Parks opined that there would be more units.

Commr. Smith pointed out that the original PUD allowed all this, and opined that the Board could not strip their rights from doing it. He reiterated that he would rather deny this application, and that they could come back with a clean slate of what they wanted to do.

Ms. Marsh commented that if the Board denied it without prejudice, then there was not a timeframe, and that they could bring it back when they had worked it out, noting that it could be a joint application to resolve all the issues.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that the applicant could build what was allowed currently, and inquired if the settlement agreement gave the applicant 21 single family units.

Commr. Campione replied that it said no less than 21 single family units.

Mr. Fitzgerald related that if they wanted to build duplexes, then this was 18 buildings with 36 dwelling units, opining that they could make them as large and nice as the architect would like to make them.

Commr. Campione passed the gavel to Commissioner Parks.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Campione and carried by a vote of 2-1, the Board denied Tab 7, Rezoning Case # PZ2025-83, Tiger Paw Estates PUD (RZ), without prejudice.

Commr. Parks voted no.

Commr. Parks passed the gavel back to Commissioner Campione.

ESCOBEDO PROPERTY (VAR)

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that Variance Case # PZ2025-375, Escobedo Property (VAR), was for a variance request to allow the creation of two lots through the minor lot split process; however, the easement that led to the parent parcel varied in width and was 10 feet wide at the narrowest point instead of the required 50 feet, noting that this came before the BCC on August 4, 2026 and was continued. He commented that the plot plan depicted the proposed lot split along the existing and proposed easement with connection to a publicly dedicated portion of Olmac Road, and that when the requested action was submitted to the Office of Fire Rescue, it was determined that the easement did not meet the minimum fire code standards for emergency access, which was why they had an issue with an additional lot. He mentioned that the Board tabled the item to give the applicant time to evaluate the feasibility of a residential sprinkler system or the possibility of an accessory dwelling unit (ADU).

Mr. Alberto Escobedo, the applicant, mentioned that he spoke with the Office of Fire Rescue and with his architect to add a sprinkler system to the new residence they were planning to build for his family, and noted that they needed the Board's approval to move forward.

Commr. Campione questioned what was learned about the sprinkler system.

Mr. Escobedo answered that they would have to add it to the inside of the home because the firetruck could not get back there due to the tightness of the dirt road to the property, and that the architect said that they would have to add a 13D residential sprinkler system for the fire safety concerns. He commented that he was in favor of this because he and his family would be there, and that if there was a fire, it would help them. He stated that they were willing to add the sprinkler system as well as create the 50 foot easement in front of the property.

Commr. Smith related that he was less concerned about the possibility of fire, opining that 90 percent of the calls were for medical reasons, and that his concern was to get medical assistance out there.

Mr. Escobedo opined that an ambulance could get to their property. He mentioned that their neighbors had five acre parcels, and that their property was a 10 acre parcel, noting that they wanted to divide it so he could build a home for his family. He relayed that he was willing to do whatever the Board asked, including adding the sprinkler system and making the easement larger.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

Commr. Campione commented that an email was received from Ms. Debbie Vickery, a resident of this area, who had indicated concern about the road maintenance and traffic, and said that she would like there to be more assistance with the road.

Mr. Escobedo opined that Ms. Vickery was concerned about more people moving to that property; however, nobody would be moving there, as they already lived there. He commented that they all maintained the dirt road which had large puddles after it rained, and that he and his brothers had been fixing the road.

Ms. Marsh clarified that there were two conditions if the Board were to approve this variance on the current day, including the requirement of the owner to ensure that the vertical clearance was maintained at all times at the owner's expense from CR 437 to the parent parcel, and the requirement of the owner to improve or cause the improvement of the access road from CR 437 to the parent parcel at the owner's expense, which could be clarified to maintaining it in a passable condition. She reiterated that if this was approved, they would be required to maintain the length of the road from their property to CR 437.

Commr. Campione opined that this would help anyone else using the road, including Ms. Vickery.

Mr. Escobedo remarked that they would be willing to do that.

Commr. Campione opined that it would be easier for an ambulance to maneuver those turns than a firetruck, and that the road would be kept passable. She opined that firetrucks responded to emergency calls and could get to locations before an ambulance could, and that they would still not have the same kind of service that somebody on a straight road would receive because a firetruck could not get to this parcel, noting that they could not get there currently. She opined that these were good conditions, including maintaining the vertical clearance as well as being responsible for the maintenance of the road.

Chief Michael Vitta, Division Chief/Fire Marshal for the Office of Fire Rescue, related that part of the conditions was that staff would have to use the Auto Computer Aided Design (AutoCAD) software to prove that the fire apparatus and emergency apparatus could make that turn, and that as long as this was proven on paper, then they would not be opposed to it.

Commr. Campione inquired if this condition was in the ordinance.

Ms. Marsh answered that this was in the ordinance, and that the only additional conditions would be the fire sprinkler system on the home to be built and to clarify that they would maintain the road so that it was passable for emergency vehicles.

Commr. Campione commented that she was in favor of helping people who were industrious and wanted to use their land to keep their family together, and opined that if they were willing to take on the added responsibility, then this would be the right thing to do.

Commr. Campione passed the gavel to Commissioner Smith.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Campione and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved Tab 9, Variance Case # PZ2025-375, Escobedo Property (VAR), with the conditions of the fire sprinklers in the home and the road being maintained so that it was passable for emergency vehicles.

Commr. Smith passed the gavel back to Commissioner Campione.

<u>NARAYANA DENTAL OFFICE (VAR)</u>

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that Variance Case # PZ2025-379, Narayana Dental Office (VAR), was for a variance to the landscape buffer requirements to accommodate a dental office with associated parking in lieu of the required 25 foot landscape buffer in front of the property, and that it was located at 4950 State Road (SR) 19A. He recalled that at the September 1, 2026 BCC meeting, this item was tabled to allow the applicant time to confer with the owner regarding

conditions of approval being based on the development of the property overall and to find out what kind of septic system they would be able to install.

Mr. Pedro Esaki, representing the applicant, commented that they discussed the advanced wastewater treatment system with the client, and that they were happy to opt into an advanced system, specifically the DWTS program with Lake County.

Commr. Parks expressed appreciation for his willingness to wait for his case to be heard again.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

Commr. Campione asked that they would try keep the trees that were there, and opined that even though it would be hard, it would prevent them from having to buy more trees.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved Tab 10, Variance Case # PZ2025-379, Narayana Dental Office (VAR).

SORRENTO HILLS – HEARTLAND DENTAL (VAR)

Mr. Fitzgerald related that Variance Case # PZ2026-160, Sorrento Hills – Heartland Dental (VAR), was for a variance to the internal landscaping in the parking areas to allow the construction of landscape islands of a reduced size in lieu of the required minimum width of 12 feet and the square footage of 300 square feet, and noted that this was located north of Tuscany Avenue and west of CR 437. He commented that the medical use of the proposed commercial use required additional parking, and that because of the irregular shape of the lot, the internal islands would need to be reduced in size. He remarked that staff's determination was that the overall intent of the code would be met with the landscape design that was presented.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that even though the outer areas had landscaping, they would not have the islands that would normally be there.

Mr. Fitzgerald clarified that they just needed those two islands because the medical use required additional parking.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that they were just moving things around, as this was a variance for the islands.

Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed this, and stated that this was a simple variance to the size of the islands, and opined that this was still a robust landscape plan.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved Tab 11, Variance Case # PZ2026-160, Sorrento Hills – Heartland Dental (VAR).

BELLA COLLINA 359E PROPERTY (VAR)

Mr. Fitzgerald relayed that Variance Case # PZ2026-194, Bella Collina 359E Property (VAR), was a variance request to allow the removal of two heritage trees to facilitate the construction of a single family residence, and that the location was 15215 Pendio Drive. He commented that the applicant had provided an affidavit to staff stating that the HOA had reviewed and approved this amendment, and that there would be mitigation fees associated with this. He remarked that the subject property was located within the Town of Montverde ISBA, and that the Town had no comments regarding this item. He displayed a concept plan showing the option of the home being built with a 90 foot setback in the front, and said that the locations of the heritage trees were circled on the footprint of the proposed home. He stated that since staff had to explore all options for variances, there was an alternative concept plan where the home was moved closer with a 50 foot setback, and that even though the heritage trees could be preserved, they would still be in close proximity to the home. He mentioned that the other houses on this street had anywhere from a 50 foot to a 150 foot front yard setback, and that if the house were to be built any farther forward, it would stand out from what the neighbors had. He commented that what was being requested on the current day was the option of having the 90 foot setback, which was in line with the neighboring houses, and having the heritage tree removed.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they would have to plant new trees.

Mr. Fitzgerald agreed, and remarked that they would still be subject to the landscape code for the number of trees that were required for the size of the lot, which was five trees minimum.

Commr. Campione opined that they could buy two mature trees in lieu of five trees, and wondered if this could be an option.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that the caliper inches for heritage trees would be replaced at 100 percent, and that this could mean smaller trees on the lot rather than one large tree. He mentioned that there was not a regulation that specifically mentioned requiring the moving of large trees.

Commr. Parks questioned if they were going to plant trees to mitigate for the loss of the heritage trees, and asked if there was a minimum caliper diameter at breast height (DBH) requirement. He inquired if the Board could add a condition to require an eight inch tree rather than a four inch tree even though it would be costly.

Mr. Fitzgerald indicated his understanding that this would be for the five trees that were required, and that the applicant was prepared to pay the mitigation fee instead of doing a replacement, which would be approximately $3,800. He commented that they would then be required to go forward with a minimum number of trees on the lot, and that if they did not pay the mitigation fee, then they had to replace the caliper inches 100 percent for the heritage trees.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they could do that in any form as long as it was replaced 100 percent.

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that if the Board voted to not let them cut down the heritage trees, then they would have to find an alternative to the footprint of the home.

Commr. Parks opined that anybody could plant four inch caliper trees, and asked if the applicant could to do some combination of the mitigation. He inquired if the Board could require

a six to eight inch caliper tree, and opined that this was more likely to stay there permanently than a four inch tree, noting that the Board had placed conditions in the past.

Mr. Fitzgerald wondered if they could place conditions that may not exist currently in the code into this variance.

Ms. Marsh commented that the Board could add any condition they felt would make it more acceptable.

Commr. Smith opined that it should be reasonable, and that an eight inch caliper tree was a very substantial tree.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that they were keeping the 34 inch oak in the front of the property.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that he did not want to discuss what might happen with the clearing of the property, and that the variance was for the removal of the heritage trees, noting that these were lakefront lots.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the previous owner left the trees there, and that this landowner was in a situation where these trees were in the middle of his lot where he could not build anything unless he came before the Board and asked to take the trees down.

Mr. Tyler Williams, the applicant, related that they planned to keep the 34 inch oak tree.

Commr. Parks expressed appreciation for this, and opined that street trees were important. He indicated his understanding that they were going to pay the mitigation fee per the code.

Mr. Williams asked if they could still plant four inch caliper trees when they replanted.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

Commr. Parks commented that if they had the 34 inch tree in the front, then this was fine, and noted that he liked to look for protection and promotion for street trees, opining that it increased property value and was good from a shading standpoint.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved Tab 12, Variance Case # PZ2026-194, Bella Collina 359E Property (VAR), noting that the applicant was going to keep the 34 inch tree in the front of the lot.

GORE PROPERTY (VAR)

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that Variance Case # PZ2026-144, Gore Property (VAR), was a variance request to the setback requirements to allow an after-the-fact accessory structure to be located nine feet from the western property line in lieu of the required ten feet, noting that this meant that this accessory structure was installed without a permit. He mentioned that the location was 29851 Coconut Avenue, and that the subject parcel was developed with a single family residence, secondary carport, pumphouse, and shed. He stated that the applicant had provided an affidavit that the HOA requirements had been met, and noted that there was a code enforcement case opened on this, which had gone to the Special Master on May 20, 2026. He commented that if this was approved, then the requested variance would allow for the zoning clearances and

building permits to be granted, and that it would resolve the code enforcement case for this carport to be located one foot closer to the side property line than would normally be allowed.

Ms. Kathy Gore, the applicant, related that she and her husband had lived in the home for 20 years, which was on a gravel road and was surrounded by the State Forest. She commented that they built a barn and a carport without a permit, and that they did all the permits for the barn and were waiting for this variance because they were one foot shy of the requirement, noting that what was next to them was woods.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

Commr. Campione opined that a one foot variance was a very reasonable request, and that she supported approving it.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved Tab 13, Variance Case # PZ2026-144, Gore Property (VAR).

LEBRON QUILES PROPERTY (VAR)

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that Variance Case # PZ2026-109, Lebron Quiles Property (VAR), was a variance request to allow an unpermitted accessory structure to remain 4.5 feet from the right of way in lieu of the required 25 feet, and that it was located at 10745 Summit Lake Lane. He commented that the subject parcel was developed with a single family residence, driveway, walkway, two sheds, and the unpermitted carport, noting that there was a notice of code violation that was issued for this. He remarked that the Public Works Department reviewed this and determined that if this carport were to remain, then a driveway apron would be required in order to protect Summit Lake Lane from damage. He mentioned that the HOA reviewed this item, and that the architectural review board indicated to staff that they did not agree with this variance being approved because they did not want a secondary driveway coming out to the road; therefore, the Public Works Department revised their comments to say that if this variance was approved, then the owners would be responsible for any damage to the road and the right of way.

Ms. Andrea Lebron Quiles, the owner, commented that when she and Mr. Wilfredo Lebron Quiles put this carport in, they were under the impression that they did not need a permit, and that when they found out that it was needed, they tried to correct this by obtaining a permit. She mentioned that the company that installed the carport told them that they did not need one.

Mr. Lebron Quiles related that it was inside their fence.

Commr. Smith inquired who the company was that installed it.

Ms. Lebron Quiles answered that it was Keen’s Buildings.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the HOA was okay with it, and that the Public Works Department wanted them to be responsible for any damage to the road.

Ms. Lebron Quiles stated that the HOA approved of them obtaining the carport, and that this was why they got it.

Commr. Smith commented that he received an email from the HOA saying that they did not approve of this.

Ms. Lebron Quiles clarified that the HOA did not approve of the driveway apron going in; however, they approved of the carport in October 2025.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that the HOA disagreed with it architecturally.

Ms. Marsh explained that the HOA did not approve of the driveway apron, which was a condition of the Public Works Department, and noted that if one was going to be pulling that type of vehicle onto the road, then it could damage the curb and the road. She commented that according to Mr. Fitzgerald's testimony, the Public Works Department was okay if there was not a driveway apron; however, the property owners would have to be responsible for the damage to the road. She remarked that if the Board was willing to accept this, then an additional condition would have to be added for a recordable agreement to be entered into showing that they were responsible for that damage, and that they should be required to list the County as an additional insured on their homeowner's policy with a limit that would suffice so that if the County had to make repairs, they could make a claim.

Commr. Campione asked if this was consistent with the email that was received, and relayed her understanding that the HOA did not want to have a cut there, noting that even though the Public Works Department wanted them to have it, they could instead sign a waiver, take responsibility for any damage, and include the County on the insurance policy for repairs.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the Shores of Lake Clair HOA architectural review committee reviewed the second driveway as shown on the site plan and determined that it was not approved, and that they requested that this information be included in the record for the variance application.

Commr. Parks reiterated that the HOA was opposing the second driveway, opining that this was understandable as it could set a precedent.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that they did not have evidence that the HOA approved the carport itself.

Ms. Lebron Quiles stated that she had the message on FaceBook that said the HOA approved it.

Commr. Parks questioned who the property manager for the HOA was.

Mr. Fitzgerald mentioned that the applicant was correct in that the HOA communicated online that they did approve the carport.

Ms. Lebron Quiles remarked that they would not have built the carport without the HOA approval.

Commr. Parks opined that putting a second driveway in was an issue across the county; however, the HOA was against it.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that the Public Works Department was requiring the second driveway to protect the street; however, they identified that this could be an issue because of the safety concerns of it being so close to the intersection.

Commr. Parks opined that this was a good reason why people should not put second driveways everywhere.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the architectural review committee did not like the second driveway option; however, the condition of the road could be protected through a maintenance agreement.

Commr. Parks opined that architectural committees and HOAs would not think about those kinds of things.

Ms. Lebron Quiles related that the trailer was only brought in and out about twice per year, as they did not move the trailer often.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the owners were not using it as a garage and coming in and out all the time, and that they were just storing their trailer there; however, she opined that if it was going in and out all the time, it could possibly damage the road, requiring them to pay the County to fix it.

Ms. Lebron Quiles mentioned that they had a special needs son, and that they needed the trailer to travel to doctors' appointments and to enjoy life.

Commr. Parks opined that even though he understood the issue, it could require a second driveway, and that even though they said it would only be used a couple of times, it could potentially be used constantly.

Ms. Lebron Quiles related that they were willing to do what they needed to if they did not have the apron.

Commr. Campione opined that the HOA was okay with it, and that it would be used for them to store a camper.

Commr. Smith opined that the owners' intent was to move the trailer as many times as they could because that meant they were going on vacation, and that the HOA letter that said they did not approve of it was referring to the second driveway. He relayed his understanding that they were willing to do something with the road condition.

Ms. Marsh commented that if the Board approved this item, an additional condition would be added that they needed to enter into an agreement with the County that would make them responsible for any of the repairs in that area, and that they would need to add the County as an additional insured to their homeowner's policy so that if the owner did not repair the damage, the County could make a claim.

Commr. Sabatini returned at 12:18 p.m.

Commr. Smith opined that there would have to be a survey to define the area to protect the homeowners.

Ms. Marsh related that they would define the area.

Mr. Lebron Quiles remarked that they could take the carport if they sold the house.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Melanie McPherson, a resident of Lake County, stated that she reviewed all the information that was presented, and opined that this was not a minor difference, as it was an 82 percent difference from 25 feet to 4.5 feet. She mentioned that the County identified the purpose of the 25 foot setback as promoting a logical development pattern, providing safe setbacks between structures and encouraging a visually pleasing environment, and she asked that the Board would

consider whether this proposal satisfied those purposes. She opined that even though the applicant said that granting the variance would remain consistent to the character of the area, the evidence did not support their statement, and that there was not another property with a structure set 4.5 feet from the right of way, a second driveway apron, or an aluminum carport. She pointed out that the Public Works Department stated that lots were restricted to one driveway apron from the internal road, and opined that since the property was on a corner with a gutter culvert, the apron may not be possible. She stated that the Public Works Department noted that the property was located at a T intersection and raised safety concerns related to the property configuration and use of the intersection, and she asked that the Board consider how allowing the unpermitted structure to remain only 4.5 feet from the right of way would affect safety. She commented that the applicant claimed that it would be a financial hardship to move the structure to comply with the 25 foot setback, which would require additional grading, the possibility of a retaining wall, and substantially more funding, opining that even though those costs were real, there was an important distinction between a hardship and the additional cost of constructing a desired improvement in a code compliant location. She stated that other property owners, including herself, had faced the same development requirements and had incurred the costs to complete their projects in compliance with the regulations, and opined that the fact that the compliant option cost more did not mean that the property could not reasonably be used. She opined that the claimed hardship was the additional cost of constructing the desired improvement in a compliant location, and that staff analysis concluded that the applicant had not demonstrated the required substantial hardship. She opined that the principle of fairness was important, and said that in LDR Section 14.15.02, it stated that when the regulations affected a particular person in a manner significantly different from the way it affected other similarly situated persons, the surrounding property owners were subject to the same requirements and had built within the applicable setbacks, dealing with the increased costs of grading, retaining walls, and other sitework.

Commr. Parks inquired if this was the only property like this.

Ms. McPherson answered that it was, and opined that they had a small neighborhood. She elaborated that they had a different HOA, and that they had 37 homes while the applicant's HOA had 10 to 15 homes.

Commr. Campione asked where she lived in relation to the applicant.

Ms. McPherson stated that she lived on Summit Lakes Lane down the road from the applicant.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the applicant's HOA was okay with the carport.

Ms. McPherson opined that according to a member of the HOA she spoke with, if they had known it was that large, they never would have approved it.

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

Ms. Lebron Quiles mentioned that the HOA had all the information, and that Ms. McPherson was in a separate HOA, noting that it was approved.

Mr. Lebron Quiles opined that this did not affect Ms. McPherson at all.

Commr. Parks commented that his issue was with the second driveway.

Ms. Lebron Quiles remarked that they were not going to put in a second driveway, and that they would just maintain the curb.

Commr. Parks opined that this would not work.

Ms. Lebron Quiles related that the structure was behind a fence, and that they had updated the landscape in front of the fence, including hedges that that would grow and block part of the view of the carport, opining that it looked very nice in that area.

Commr. Parks questioned if the Public Works Department was requesting the second driveway if this was approved.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the Public Works Department initially requested a driveway apron for the protection of the road; however, they noted that it would be considered a possible safety concern because of the proximity of the intersection.

Commr. Parks opined that the second driveway idea was an issue in many neighborhoods, and that HOAs may not see this as an issue. He indicated concern about a precedent that could be set, and opined that more people may want second driveways.

Commr. Campione pointed out that the Board could approve it without authorizing a second driveway.

Commr. Parks mentioned that the Public Works Department would prefer a second driveway.

Commr. Campione stated that the HOA was against it.

Commr. Smith commented that the owners had been using this property for their RV with no issues until this structure was put up, and asked how long they had owned the RV.

Ms. Lebron Quiles answered that they had owned it since 2022.

Commr. Parks opined that the carport had drawn much attention because it was a large structure, and that it was only 4.5 feet from the property line.

Commr. Campione related that there were not many people against it at the current meeting or writing to the County, and that even though she was sympathetic to what the neighbor said, she was also sympathetic to the applicants who wanted to cover their RV, which would still just be sitting there, noting that they planted shrubs, which would grow up. She opined that the County was trying to come up with something that everyone could live with even though it would not be perfect and would not make everyone happy.

Ms. McPherson expressed concerns about the size and if it was secured properly, opining that a hurricane could have taken it out.

Ms. Lebron Quiles clarified that it was windproof.

Commr. Campione commented that if they got a permit, then this would be checked out.

Ms. McPherson opined that if this was addressed, then this would alleviate much concern.

Ms. Lebron Quiles remarked that it was supposed to be able to withstand 180 mile per hour winds, and that they looked into that when they picked out a carport.

Commr. Smith related that there was usually a 150 mile per hour wind loading on it, and hoped that they kept their engineering report because the permitting department would need that when they came out to inspect it to ensure that it was anchored down correctly with the proper anchors to withstand the 150 mile per hour wind load. He mentioned that he respected the Public Works Department, opining that they were trying to protect the edge of the roads. He opined that the edge of the road could be protected with the agreement making the applicant responsible for that section where they went over it, noting that because they had this RV since 2022, the only difference was the structure.

Commr. Campione opined that this was not an unmaintained property, as they took good care of it, and that they planted shrubs and were trying to do the right thing. She opined that when the shrubs grew up, it would help buffer the visual of the structure, and that since it was safe and would not blow away, everything would work out in the long run.

Commr. Parks commented that he was opposed to the second driveway, that he respected what staff engineers had asked for issuance, and that he respected the HOA process. He opined that as someone with experience with zoning clearances and these types of issues all over the county, this was the kind of thing that could be an issue, as it set a precedent, and that he would be voting no on the application.

Commr. Smith remarked that this variance approval did not negate the applicants from having to go through and pass all the building codes and requirements to get the proper permit, noting that if this was not done, then they would have to take the building down.

Commr. Campione mentioned that the applicants would have to sign all the documents required by staff so that if the road was damaged, it would have to be fixed and would be insured.

Commr. Campione passed the gavel to Commissioner Parks.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Campione and carried by a vote of 3-1, the Board approved Tab 14, Variance Case # PZ2026-109, Lebron Quiles Property (VAR), with the additional condition of the applicant entering into an agreement with the County to make them responsible for any repairs to the road in the defined area, and to add the County as an additional insured to their homeowners policy so that if it was not repaired, the County could make a claim.

Commr. Parks voted no.

Commr. Parks passed the gavel back to Commissioner Campione.

MILLER & COBB PROPERTY (VAR)

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that Variance Case # PZ2026-191, Miller & Cobb Property (VAR), was a variance request to allow for a 24 foot by 14 foot screen room to be located 46 feet from the mean high water line in lieu of the required 50 feet, and that it was located at 26845 CR 448A. He stated that the subject property was developed with a two story single family residence, wooden dock, concrete driveway, backyard patio, concrete walkway, front patio, and two metal sheds, and that when the Public Works Department reviewed this, they determined that if this variance was approved and the screen room was installed, then they wanted an engineered design for an interceptor swale that was sized to capture the first one inch of stormwater runoff. He

commented that when the floodplain manager reviewed this, he determined a design floor elevation minimum requirement, and requested that this not be enclosed or climate controlled going forward but would remain a screen room. He then displayed the conceptual plan showing the setback to the lake.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

Commr. Smith commented that this was an existing concrete pad, and that they just wanted to put a screen room on top, opining that it had no effect on anything. He mentioned that they would have to pull a permit and meet all the regulations.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that there was supposed to be a 50 foot setback, and that they were asking for 46.44 feet instead.

Commr. Smith reiterated that they had an existing concrete pad, and noted that they were not adding anything, as they were just putting a screen room on top of what they already had.

Commr. Campione passed the gavel to Commissioner Parks.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Campione and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved Tab 15, Variance Case # PZ2026-191, Miller & Cobb Property (VAR).

Commr. Parks passed the gavel back to Commissioner Campione.

REGULAR AGENDA

LAKE COUNTY PROPERTY APPRAISER BUDGET APPEAL REQUEST

Commr. Sabatini commented that there was a lack of success appealing the budget in the prior year, opining that this was based on the voluminous number of appeals around the state. He relayed his understanding that nobody had success on these cases on either the Commission side or the Executive Officer side, and that this item would renew that effort. He stated that he maintained the same objection of the rapid unjustified spending increase for the previous and current years.

Commr. Campione recalled that in the prior year, she was unhappy with the increase, and opined that it was too high and did not represent what everyone else was doing to keep the budget down. She commented that because the County did not win the first time, there was a budget that was too high to begin with that had to be contested again, reaffirming it, and opined that since the Lake County Property Appraiser was an autonomous Constitutional Officer, it was difficult determining what they did or did not need.

Commr. Smith questioned if this appeal was going to cost the citizens of Lake County more funding.

Commr. Sabatini indicated his understanding that it would not, as it was completely internally administratively handled, and that the County was not hiring extra lobbyists to do this.

Commr. Smith remarked that the County was not approved the previous time, and that since the argument was only for about $1 million on a duly elected Constitutional Officer, he was not in favor of continually going after this cause, noting that the County had never done this before

the previous year, which he opined was for an exorbitant amount. He opined that there would not be any viable solution to it, and that since the Lake County Property Appraiser was a Constitutional Officer, he had to answer to the voters of Lake County.

Commr. Sabatini opined that even though these were fair points, this did not in any way invalidate the process, and that this was a toolset that the BCC should normalize using, especially when there was an unfair answer about a large difference in funding. He mentioned that there was a new cabinet, and that even though he trusted the old cabinet, there were many appeals that came in the previous year, opining that they did not know what to do with them as there were many political items moving, especially in an election year. He opined that once the elections were done, the County could win this appeal, and that the cabinet would be more sober minded. He opined that even though one budget year was less than the other, this could not be bifurcated, and that even though there was a budget where one spent an extra $1 million and then came up with a smaller increase the following year, it was still unjustified. He opined that this spending pattern could not follow up on an exorbitant one and not be substantially related in some way, and that the type of spending was an accrual and a furtherment of the previous spending. He remarked that he had very serious questions, and opined that the cabinet should have overruled the previous spending. He opined that even though the budget amount could be worse, this was the right thing to do, and that the BCC was just asking the cabinet to take a look and listen to the arguments.

Commr. Campione expressed concern about it compounding what was already a large increase, and opined that the current year's $1 million was on top of what was disagreed about the first year. She opined that the County did not get heard by the cabinet because no one would take it up.

Commr. Parks mentioned that some Constitutional Officers had weighed in on Florida Amendment 3, and opined that if this passed, then it would have to be addressed as the voters would like them to. He opined that the spending was significant each year, and said that he would support this item.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that there would not be funding coming from the citizens of Lake County, and that this would just be to look to see what there was.

Ms. Marsh confirmed this, and stated that it would be handled internally in the County Attorney's Office.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to further the appeal.

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY FINANCE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to appoint Ms. Jaime Stewart, Office of Management and Budget Director, to the Central Florida Expressway Authority Finance Committee.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER SABATINI – DISTRICT 1

FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES (FAC) LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE

Commr. Sabatini mentioned that December 2026 would be the Florida Association of Counties (FAC) Legislative Conference, and opined that the Board should all be there. He opined that if Florida Amendment 3 passed, then there would need to be changes made in the City of Tallahassee that would help Lake County, and that if it did not pass, then they could address items that could cause issues for constituents.

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

GOOD MEETINGS

Commr. Parks relayed that he had some good meetings recently, and that he had reported on the good news from the City of Tavares in a previous BCC meeting.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Commr. Smith opined that it was a busy weekend for economic development throughout the county, and stated that Hickory Point Park had a large volleyball tournament with 150 teams, about 300 participants, and over 700 spectators. He commented that the Big House had a busy weekend, and that there was an Asian event at the Lake Square Mall. He opined that Lake County was making strides with economic development and active tourism, and that it was a result of the leadership and staff, including Mr. Bobby Bonilla, Assistant County Manager. He opined that there were good things coming from Discover Lake, and asked Ms. Meg Brew, Director for the Office of Tourism and Economic Development, and Ms. Kathleen Dial, Executive Director of Development Services, to come up and discuss the Henry Award. He mentioned that it was the first time Lake County had received it, and he asked Ms. Brew to explain what it was and what it meant to Lake County.

Ms. Brew commented that she gave full credit to the staff in the Office of Tourism and Economic Development as well as the partnership with Madden Media/Karsh Hagan Madden (KHM), who was their agency of record, and that this award was a testimony to the effort they put into targeted marketing. She related that this award was in recognition of an out of home marking campaign that they did in Sough Florida to entice people to trade the hustle and bustle of the traffic in the City of Miami and to spend a weekend of tranquility in Lake County, and that they highlighted all the natural aspects offered in Lake County as an alternative. She mentioned that this was the highest award given out by Visit Florida, and that when they went to the Florida Governor's Conference in the previous month, they knew that Lake County had been nominated, opining that it was very exciting to win the award and to be onstage with the team.

Commr. Smith indicated appreciation to Ms. Brew, and opined that they were doing a phenomenal job.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

FIND, FEED AND RESTORE EVENT

Commr. Campione commented that she and Commissioner Parks attended the Find, Feed and Restore event, and that the Chamber of Commerce team participated in an event with the City of Clermont Police Department.

FERNDALE PRESERVE

Commr. Campione related that she visited the dock and tower at Ferndale Preserve, and that she highly recommended it.

GREEN MOUNTAIN SCENIC OVERLOOK AND TRAILHEAD

Commr. Campione said that she visited the Green Mountain Scenic Overlook and Trailhead and saw the new tower that they had started working on, opining that they would be moving ahead quickly. She opined that this would be a place that people would come from all over to see.

Commr. Sabatini asked when they were supposed to be done.

Commr. Campione opined that it would be happen quickly, and relayed her understanding that even though the elevator would not be fabricated until the structure itself was finished, they would still be able to open it.

Mr. Bobby Bonilla, Assistant County Manager, related that the estimated time of completion for the second tower was April 2027, and that this was with the option to use the staircase, noting that the elevator would follow after that.

LAKE MAY RESERVE

Commr. Campione remarked that in her quest to visit all of the conservation areas in the county, she visited Lake May Reserve, and opined that if one hiked the trail, they should take someone with them as it was very wild and natural. She opined that since it was undergoing restoration, it was not a perfect hiking trail, and noted that she may have seen evidence of a bear there.

INTERSECTION OF THRILL HILL ROAD AND CR 44A

Commr. Campione recalled the discussion the Board had about how dangerous the intersection of Thrill Hill Road and CR 44A was, and noted that staff had worked on a design of a roundabout that would be to the side of the intersection where it would not affect all four corners; therefore; she would like to discuss the possibility of using this and applying for safety grants.

ROUNDABOUT AT EUDORA ROAD, CR 19A, AND OLD HIGHWAY 441

Commr. Campione mentioned that even though there had been much negative feedback about the roundabout at the intersection of Eudora Road, CR 19A, and Old Highway 441, staff had worked with the businesses and placed signage to help, and she indicated appreciation to them, opining that once one got used to the situation, it was not hard to navigate. She opined that the new small roundabout functioned well, and that the Public Works Department did a great job. She recommended that the Board travel through there to see what was going on, as it would change in the future when that intersection was completely closed down, opining that people would have to find other routes and get used to them. She recalled that over 100 accidents had happened at that intersection, and that there had been many issues.

Commr. Smith opined that the residents needed more facts other than what was on social media, and that there were significant issues at this intersection that the County had been working on for over seven years.

Commr. Campione opined that once the work was done, people would like it.

BRITT ROAD

Commr. Campione commented that Britt Road was moving along, and that the asphalt was currently being laid. She related that they were on target to finish and open it up by the end of the current month, opining that all those who relied on this road were very excited about seeing what the changes would be like on CR 44B once Britt Road opened. She expressed appreciation to staff for keeping the Board informed so that they could let everyone know when it would be open.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

NATIONAL NOODLE DAY

Commr. Smith stated that it was National Noodle Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:54 p.m.

_____

LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____

GARY J COONEY, CLERK