

**LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY/
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**
COUNTY SERVICES BUILDING
ROOM 1028
March 6, 2002 – 7:00 P.M.
MINUTES

Board Present:

Ben Tucker, Chairman
Dick Harris
Don Nicholas
Paul Tremel

Staff Present:

Don Fisher, Planning and Development Director
Matt West, Planning Division Manager
Amanda Smith, Planning Division
Shannon Suffron, Development Review Division
John Thomson, Development Review Division
Karen Consalo, Assistant County Attorney

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tucker convened the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Quorum was established.

ACCEPTANCE OF PROOF OF PUBLICATION

Motion by Commissioner Tremel to accept proof of publication. Second by Commissioner Nicholas.

Motion passed unanimously. (4-0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Nicholas had one correction. On page 2, Item V, should be Nicholas instead of Chairman Nicholas.

Motion by Commissioner Nicholas to approve the February 6, 2002, minutes, as revised. Second by Commissioner Tremel.

Motion passed unanimously. (4-0)

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. REFLECTIONS - SR 46 RON QUIGLEY, QUIGLEY AND COMPANY;
APPROXIMATELY 70 ACRES MORE OR LESS; REZONE FROM COUNTRY HOMES
DISTRICT (RC-1) AND AGRICULTURE (A-1) TO PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT
(PUD); SOUTH OF SR 46 ACROSS FROM YANKEE LAKE.
COMMISSIONER MCLAIN — DISTRICT #5**

AMANDA SMITH

This item was withdrawn.

B. SPACEPORT USA SPACEPORT USA/ANDRE HICKMAN, PRESIDENT/SID VIHLEN, PROJECT MANAGER; APPROXIMATELY 64.02 ACRES MORE OR LESS; REZONE FROM M-1A (VERY LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) TO PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT); NORTH AND WEST SIDE OF HICKMAN DRIVE EAST OF I-4.
COMMISSIONER MCLAIN - DISTRICT #5 JEFF HOPPER

This item was withdrawn.

C. GREENWAY CENTER E.G. BANKS-CHARLES W CLAYTON JR/W MALCOLM CLAYTON; APPROX 73 ACRES MORE OR LESS; LARGE SCALE PLAN AMENDMENT FROM MDR (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) TO PD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT); REZONE FROM A-1 (AGRICULTURE) TO PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT); NORTH OF SR 426 AND WEST OF GREENWAY (SR 417).
COMMISSIONER MALOY DISTRICT #1 CINDY MATHENY

This item was withdrawn.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. MARKHAM ESTATES MARKHAM ESTATES LLC,/RUDOLPH RODE; APPROXIMATELY 39.63 ACRES MORE OR LESS; PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVAL FOR 29 LOT, SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE, ZONED RC-1 NORTHEAST CORNER OF MARKHAM ROAD AND LONGWOOD MARKHAM ROAD
COMMISSIONER MCLAIN — DISTRICT #5 SHANNON SUFFRON

The applicant, Markham Estates, LLC, is requesting the approval of a 30 lot Preliminary Subdivision Plan for the Markham Estates Subdivision. The property is approximately 39.6 +/- acres and is zoned RC-1, which allows 1 acre lot sizes. The minimum lot width at the building line is 120' and the minimum house size is 1,200 square feet. Each proposed lot has a minimum of 1 acre of buildable area.

The property is on septic and water is being provided by Seminole County. The PSP meets all Land Development Code requirements. The project is also located within the Wekiva River Protection Area and the Scenic Corridor Overlay for Markham Road, Longwood-Markham Road and Lake Markham Road. The applicant has been made aware of this and has agreed to comply with the applicable development standards for both of these overlay districts.

Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Subdivision Plan.

Motion by Commissioner Harris for approval of the PSP. Second by Commissioner Nicholas.

Motion passed unanimously. (4-0)

B. STURBRIDGE OAKS (PSP RESOURCE ALLIANCE, INC/MARK CRONE, PRESIDENT; APPROXIMATELY 22.84 ACRES MORE OR LESS; PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVAL FOR 7 LOTS, SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE, ZONED R-1AAAA,RC-1; LAKE DRIVE/ BIRD ROAD.
COMMISSIONER MORRIS — DISTRICT #2 JOHN THOMSON

The applicant is requesting approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan for 7 single family residential lots on 23 acres. This project is located on the east side of Lake Drive and Bird Road and on the west side of Little Lake Howell.

The portion of the subdivision that contains the lots (9.8 acres) was recently rezoned from B-1AAAA and BC-1 to R-1AAAA and RC-1. The 4 lots of the subdivision adjacent to Bird Road were rezoned to R-1AAAA (112 acre minimum lot size) and the 3 lots adjacent to Little Lake Howell were rezoned to BC (1 acre minimum lot size). The remaining southerly 13.1 acres of the subdivision contains wetlands which will be incorporated into a conservation easement. Water will be provided by connection to Seminole County Utilities and wastewater treated by individual septic systems.

Staff has reviewed the preliminary subdivision and finds that it is consistent with the development order that was executed by the developer as part of the rezoning. The development order included a conceptual subdivision layout plan, no provision for public access to the lake, and primary access from Bird Road. The preliminary subdivision also meets the development standards of the R-1AAAA and BC-1 zoning categories and the applicable requirements of the Land Development Code.

Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Subdivision Plan.

Motion by Commissioner Harris for approval of the PSP. Second by Commissioner Tremel.

Motion passed unanimously. (4-0)

C. OVIEDO COMMERCE CENTER WATSON REALTY/DON RUDOLPH; A MAJOR REVISION TO THE OVIEDO COMMERCE CENTER PCD (PLANNED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT) FINAL SITE PLAN AND DEVELOPER'S COMMITMENT AGREEMENT TO ALLOW AN AUTO REPAIR FACILITY; LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF SR 426, APPROXIMATELY 1000' NORTH OF MIKLER ROAD.

COMMISSIONER MALOY - DISTRICT #1

AMANDA SMITH

The applicants, Don Rudolph and George Viele, are requesting to amend the Final Master Site Plan and Developer's Commitment Agreement for the Oviedo Commerce Center PCD to allow automotive repair, which is located on the west side of SR 426, approximately 1000 feet north of Mikler Road.

The PCD was approved by the Seminole County Board of Commissioners in December 2000, and permits a variety of uses within the CN (Restricted Neighborhood), CS (Convenience Commercial), C-1 (Retail Commercial), C-2 (Retail Commercial), C-3 (General Commercial and Wholesale), and M-1A (Very Light Industrial) zoning districts.

The approved Developer's Commitment Agreement prohibited any mechanical garage facilities. Since the development of the project, the applicants have had several inquiries from perspective tenants for the placement of automotive repair facilities and performance centers at this location.

Staff is not opposed to the addition of automotive repair or performance centers as permitted uses within the PCD. The uses, however, will alter the overall complexion of the development, and

Staff suggests the following conditions be placed within the developer's commitment agreement:

1. There shall be no outside repair facilities. All repair shall take place within the buildings.
2. There shall be no outside storage of automotive parts and supplies.

3. The applicants shall designate an area within the interior of the PCD where automobiles left for repair may be stored.
4. There shall be no storage of salvaged or abandoned vehicles on the premises.
5. Any bays dedicated for automotive repair shall not be seen from any rights-of-way or property lines and shall be located in the interior of the development.
6. An automotive performance center shall be permitted within the buildings along SR 426, provided that no overhead doors/bay shall be seen from any rights-of-way or property lines.
7. In order to adequately screen the automotive uses from the adjacent properties, additional landscaping may be required per the Planning Manager's discretion at the time of site plan review.

Commissioner Harris asked if Item #5 was possible to lay out the way it was stated?

Ms. Smith said it was very possible to put automotive repair within the facility and make sure it is adequately screened with landscaping.

Commissioner Harris asked if the applicant or the developer contest any of the conditions?

Ms. Smith said no.

Don Rudolph, the applicant, said there won't be any overhead doors that face 426 and once all four buildings are constructed even the buildings to the back will not have direct visual impact on the road. After reviewing the staff recommendations, he feels these are adequate to work with.

Commissioner Harris said the intent is to screen from view and his concern where it says "shall not be seen" is an absolute. He feels this is a very heavy requirement.

Ms. Smith said staff could work out some different wording that would be more appropriate to what you want.

Commissioner Harris said the words don't quite match the intent. He recommended the wording be changed to:

Any bays dedicated for automotive repair shall ~~not be seen~~ be screened from any rights-of-way or property lines and shall be located in the interior of the development.

Ms. Smith said staff would not be opposed to that change.

Motion by Commissioner Harris for approval with the adjustment to staff recommendation #5, as indicated. Second by Commissioner Nicholas.

Motion passed unanimously. (4-0)

D. LAKEWOOD POINTE LAKEWOOD POINTE, INC/LEE MUNIZZI; APPROXIMATELY 3.9 ACRES MORE OR LESS; SMALL SCALE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (LDR) TO OFFICE PROFESSIONAL (OP); AND REZONE FROM AGRICULTURE (A-1) TO OFFICE PROFESSIONAL (OP); PROPOSED OFFICE COMPLEX; EAST SIDE OF

LONGWOOD-LAKE MARY ROAD, APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE SOUTH OF GREENWAY BOULEVARD.

COMMISSIONER MORRIS - DISTRICT #2

AMANDA SMITH

The applicant is requesting a small scale land use amendment from Low Density Residential to Office and an associated rezoning from A-1 (Agriculture) to OP (Office Professional) on approximately 3.9 acres located on the east side of Longwood-Lake Mary Road for the development of an office complex.

The proposed plan would permit the construction of 8 general office buildings ranging in size from 3,000 to 5200 square feet. The office future land use designation is considered a compatible transitional land use adjacent to commercial and light industrial land uses and may be a compatible transitional land use adjacent to low density residential with the use of sensitive site design, sufficient buffering and architectural controls. While the area surrounding the subject property already has a number of non-residential land uses, Planning staff believes that with additional landscaping along Longwood Lake Mary Road, low monument style signage and the buildings kept to a residential scale and design proposed land uses would be compatible with the adjacent land uses without further altering the character and viability of the existing residential to the west.

Although the adjacent property to the east of the proposed development, the railroad corridor and the retention facility, has a future land use designation of low density residential, it is staff's opinion that these serve as sufficient buffers.

Therefore, Planning staff does not believe that the proposed development should have any additional active/passive buffers along the eastern property line.

PLAN AMENDMENT: Staff recommends approval of Planned Development land use with findings that Planned Development land use, as proposed, would be:

1. Consistent with Plan policies related to the Office land use designation; and
2. Consistent with adjacent Low Density Residential and Commercial land uses; and
3. An appropriate transitional use at this location; and
4. Consistent with Plan policies identified at this time.

REZONE: Based on the above analysis, staff recommends that the subject request:

1. Is in compliance with the applicable provisions of the Vision 2020 Plan and the Seminole County Land Development Code related to OP zoning; and
2. The request, as proposed, would be compatible with surrounding development and surrounding Future Land Use designations of Commercial and Low Density Residential.

Therefore, staff recommends approval of the rezoning from A- 1 (Agriculture) to OP (Office Professional), by means of the attached development order.

The conditions upon this development approval and the commitments made as to this development approval, all of which have been accepted by and agreed to by the owner of the property are as follows:

- a. All signage for the site shall adhere to the Lake Mary Boulevard Overlay standards.

- b. In lieu of an active/passive buffer along the eastern property line, adjacent to the railroad corridor, there shall be a five foot landscaping buffer consisting of understory trees every 20' and hedge materials of 3' in height at the time of planting.
- c. Deliveries and trash pick-up shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- d. On-site building lighting shall be limited to wall-washer or up-light fixtures that do not produce spillover lighting; floodlight fixtures mounted on building walls, roofs or poles are prohibited. Internal site lighting shall be shoebox in style and not exceed 15' in height.
- e. Landscaping along Longwood-Lake Mary Road shall include a row of canopy and a row of understory trees which shall be staggered to provide maximum visual screening. Trees shall have a minimum caliper of 3" and the owner shall provide 2 canopy trees and 4 understory trees per 100 lineal feet of the property boundary.
- f. If counted as open space, the stormwater retention facility shall be aesthetically enhanced.
- g. No neon lights shall be utilized on buildings or signs. No billboards or electronic message type signage shall be permitted.
- h. Roofs shall be hip or gable. No visible flat roofs. Rooflines and features shall be consistent with the building's mass and scale.
- i. All utilities shall be underground.
- j. The architectural style of the buildings shall be similar in style as depicted in Exhibit "C".

Commissioner Harris asked if the intent in item #h that there are to be no flat roofs or is staff specifying a look?

Ms. Smith said that staff is specifying a look in this case.

Lee Minizzi, the applicant agreed with staff conditions and asked for Board approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jane McKelvry, 226 Haley Boulevard, has lived in the area since 1969. She wanted to know if the ground was going to be rechecked because it used to be the old dump for the City of Longwood. She also wanted to know if the water and sewer was going to be put in by the County.

Ms. Smith she has no previous knowledge of this property being a landfill. The property to the north is actually contaminated to some degree but she has not been told anything from staff. If it were, it would have to be assessed at final engineering with an environmental study.

The applicant will be connecting to County water and sewer in that area at their expense.

Chairman Tucker asked if there was water and sewer available in the area?

Ms. Smith said yes.

Chairman Tucker asked why it was not available to the residential section?

Mr. West said it is probably only available along Longwood-Lake Mary Road and Ms. MdKelvry is one block behind it. Mr. West said he would get with Environmental Services to see about her particular situation but there is a water main and a force main on Longwood-Lake Mary Road.

Jesse Lawrence, 1982 Longwood-Lake Mary Road, said there is a water main directly in front of his house. He has asked the County to put water across the road and he was told it would be \$2,500+ to run the water line under the road just for him. The people behind him want the water also but the County won't do it unless we establish some kind of a corporation to get the water.

Chairman Tucker asked Mr. Lawrence if he had opposition to this item as it is presented?

Mr. Lawrence said no.

Mr. Munizzi said some soil boring were done over the last several months and at this point it doesn't appear to have any soil contamination. There is some junk on the property, they he intends to clean up.

Motion by Commissioner Harris to approve with staff recommendations A through J. Second by Commissioner Tremel.

Motion passed unanimously. (4-0)

E. FAIRY LAKE JIM STELLING/TOM NORRELL; SMALL SCALE LAND USE AMENDMENT FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO COMMERCIAL; REZONE FROM A-1 (AGRICULTURE) TO PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT); EAST SIDE OF FAIRY LAKE AND WEST SIDE OF 17-92, APPROXIMATELY 400 FEET NORTH OF KATHRYN DRIVE.

COMMISSIONER HENLEY — DISTRICT #4

MATT WEST

The applicant is requesting a large-scale land use amendment from Low Density Residential to Commercial and a rezoning from A-1 and C-2 to PUD in order to develop commercial uses on the rear of two lots abutting Fairy Lake. Staff recommends Planned Development land use rather than the requested Commercial land use.

The proposed PUD consists of limited C-2 uses and would address development standards related to buffering, lighting, and design in order to minimize impacts to residential areas across the lake.

Staff is in support of this request because the property owner has the intent to try to market this for office or more upscale uses than are currently in the area. With the conditions of approval that staff placed on this PUD, staff feels confident that the end product would be better than the current zoning would allow for. Staff has incorporated approximately 20 development conditions that would specify and create some higher level of design standards in exchange for the property that is currently zoned A-1 fronting the lake also being allowed to have some limited commercial uses.

PLAN AMENDMENT: Staff recommends approval of Planned Development land use with findings that Planned Development land use, as proposed, would be:

1. Consistent with Plan policies related to the Planned Development land use designation; and

2. Consistent with adjacent Commercial and Low Density Residential land use designations; and
3. Consistent with Plan policies related to development standards for transitional land uses; and
4. Consistent with existing development trends along the 17-92 corridor; and
5. Consistent with other Plan policies identified at this time.

REZONE: Based on the above analysis, staff recommends:

1. The request, as proposed, would be compatible with surrounding development; and
2. The request, as proposed, would be consistent with the Seminole County Land Development Code regarding

Staff recommends approval of PUD zoning on the site, subject to:

1. Permitted uses shall include all permitted and conditional uses in the C-2 (Retail Commercial) zoning district, except car washes, automobile repair (unless accessory to the main business on the parcel), and drive-thru businesses (except banks and drug stores shall be permitted with drive-thrus).
2. Passive recreational uses, such as a dock or gazebo, shall be permitted on Fairy Lake. However, there shall be no motorized watercraft or commercial uses on the lake.
3. There shall be a minimum of a 50' wide upland buffer from the mean high water line of the lake and associated wetlands.
4. The parking spaces may be reduced to 9' by 18', with only one row of double-loaded parking between any buildings and the lake.
5. For every ten parking spaces, there shall be one landscape break the size of a parking space, exclusive of curb and gutters.
6. There shall be a minimum 15' wide landscape buffer along 17-92.
7. Landscaping along the lakefront shall consist of 4 canopy trees of 3" caliper, supplemented with four 30-gallon understory trees per 100'. Existing vegetation may fulfill the requirement as determined by the Planning Manager.
8. There shall be a 6' wide foundation landscape buffer between parking lots and buildings.
9. All new or relocated utilities on site shall be installed underground.
10. The Owner shall be encouraged to construct pedestrian connections (a sidewalk) from sidewalks within the public rights-of-way (US 17-92) to internal sidewalks to provide for pedestrian paths to building entrances.
11. No outdoor amplification of sound shall be permitted.
12. All sides of buildings shall have uniform architectural style, detail, trim, features, and roof treatments. No side shall have the appearance of a loading/service area. Quality of design shall be similar to "Shoppes at Oakmonte" as it appears as of March 28, 2002.

13. Roofs shall appear to be hip or gable. Rooflines and features shall be consistent with the building's mass and scale.
14. Mechanical units, whether ground or roof-mounted, shall be screened from view.
15. All meter boxes, dumpsters, and loading/service areas shall be enclosed with an 8' wall on 3 sides, with a metal or wood gate on the fourth side. The access side shall be oriented away from the adjacent residential/lakefront properties. The material and color of the enclosure(s) shall match the proposed building(s), except meter boxes shall be subject to local code issues.
16. No neon lights shall be utilized on buildings or signs. No billboards or electronic message type signage shall be permitted.
17. The building façade facing the lakefront shall not contain any commercial signage.
18. All signage for the site shall adhere to the Lake Mary Boulevard Overlay standards.
19. All retail businesses shall be closed from 12 a.m. to 6 am.
20. Trash pickup shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m.
21. On-site building lighting on the lakeside of buildings shall be limited to wall-washer or up-light fixtures that do not produce spillover lighting; floodlight fixtures mounted on building walls, roofs, or poles are prohibited.
22. If the stormwater retention areas are to be fenced, they shall be aesthetically pleasing. No bathed wire, razor wire, or plain chain-link fencing shall be permitted.
23. No off-site signage (billboards) shall be permitted.

Commissioner Harris asked about the lighting mention in item #21.

Mr. West said the staff's concern on the side of the building facing the lake, they didn't want wall packs or flood lights which might reflect off the lake. Staff did allow that if an office building was put there, they might have ground mounted accent lighting to shine on the building to make it look nice. That doesn't create the bleed over that a security light would but still allow some lighting on the rear of the building.

Commissioner Harris asked if #21 pertained to only the lakeside or are flood lights and other lighting that would spill over onto 17-92 prohibited as well.

Mr. West said it just for between the building and the lake.

Commissioner Nicholas asked if Seminole County had standards like the Lake Mary Boulevard standards?

Mr. West said yes. The only difference between Seminole County's regular sign code and Lake Mary Boulevard is mainly concerning ground signs where you are required to have a masonry base.

Chairman Tucker said the other night the County Commission heard the Wekiva Lighting Overlay and there was some discussion to having that as a countywide code. Would that comply with this?

Mr. West said this would not completely comply with that because the lighting ordinance it says all lighting shall be cut off and downward directed. The Commissioner recognized that there were some areas in the County where there may be an industrial area where that is not as big a factor.

Chairman Tucker asked if that would be appropriate, at least on the backside of this property?

Mr. West said yes, staff could do that. At the time this was drafted, staff did not have the lighting standards finalized for the Wekiva. He can get with the applicant prior to the BCC meeting and see if staff can incorporate some of these standards for the property between the building and the lake.

Mr. Stelling, representing the applicant, agrees with staff recommendations and asked for Board approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dan Anderson, 330 Isabella Drive, is opposed to the request. He is concerned that redevelopment protects and doesn't impact the lake and suddenly have commercial on the lake. Communication towers and restaurants on the back half of that would have an impact. Nobody would object to an office on the back half especially with the conditions that have been listed.

He would like to have large oak trees on the rear of the property preserved which would go a long way towards keeping that buffer and mitigating any impacts. The requirement is to put in 4 trees of 3" caliper but that is not much across 2 lots. Right now there are mature trees there and if they were to go away, that would have an impact.

Another issue is the water and sewer service. It is stated in the staff report that it is within the City of Casseberry's service area. It is actually in the City of Longwood. That could have an impact in the future because the City of Longwood has a policy that people that are adjacent to the city seeking to use city services need to annex into the city.

Angella Moore, 790 E. Wildmere Avenue, is opposed to the request. She is confused as to where the building is going. She asked staff to show her on the map where the building would be.

Mr. West pointed it out on the map.

She feels that this is a residential lake and if commercial were built it will devalue her property.

Beverly Campbell, 1411 S. Grant Street, is opposed to the request. She feels it would increase lake pollution, traffic on the roads and more importantly it will increase traffic on the lake. The lake is already maxed out. It is approximately 50 acres and there are days when there are 15-20 crafts on the lake. Some day there will be a fatality.

She said if the offices were built, they should look like residential properties and make it look like houses. That way it would not devalue the other residential property in the area.

John and Janet Knudsen, 1054 Foggy Brook Lane, is concerned about the uses that will be allowed. He is okay with office buildings as long as the lights did not shine on the lake. He is concerned about the gazebo that is going down there and that it will produce too much traffic. He wanted restrictions on the use of the gazebo. He wanted to know if the owners were willing to commit to using this just for office space.

Mark McClarnon, 628 Wildmere Avenue, is concerned about where the high water line is determined and where the 50' buffer is going to begin and end. There is a heavily wooded buffer already there with some gigantic oak trees. He encouraged that a tree survey be done so that the planners can make an accurate evaluation of what is on this property. He doesn't feel that the landscaping condition in #7 will buffer the light and noise.

Commissioner Harris said that what #7 actually says is 4 canopy trees of 3" caliper and 4 understory trees per 100'. So there will be 8 trees per lineal feet which is a far different requirement that what everyone is perceiving.

Carleen Paloyan, 754 Wildmere Avenue, has lived on the lake for 34 years and she has seen deterioration of the lake. She does not want the any more of the property on the lake zoned commercial.

Mr. Stelling said he has agreed to all of staff's conditions and restrictions. The property is on the market so whoever buys it will have to come in with a proposal. They will have to come before the LPA and work with staff and build within the parameters listed for the site. As far as lake pollution is concerned, the property actually drains towards 17-92 and not the lake.

Commissioner Harris said that when we look at sites such as this, there are a number of factors here that play major roles. First of all, we have a applicant who is a willing partner in taking what exists along 17-92 and changing it into something that we all want to see improved. By coming for a PUD, the applicant is ensuring that the County will have continuing, detailed involvement in approval on each and every step of the way. Every item becomes open to negotiation between the applicant and the County under a PUD process. What has been established already is a groundwork of some 23 requirements, some relatively innocuous and some very extensive. Those 23 requirements are a prototype for development in the 17-92 redevelopment area and cover a lot more ground than almost any other development we have had along a major artery. A couple of nice things in there is protection for the lake. One is the 50' setback and the second is the no commercial uses on the lake. The gazebo is likely to be a picnic area for employees if this turns into an office park.

As we look at and evaluate the various factors here, what we have is a set of requirements which constitute a very positive beginning for the 17-92 redevelopment. We are in essence setting the groundwork of what the expectation will be.

Motion by Commissioner Harris for approval of a small-scale comprehensive plan amendment from Low Density Residential to Planned Development and approval of the rezoning from A- (Agriculture) and C-2 (Retail Commercial) to PUD (Planned Unit) as presented by staff. Second by Commissioner Tremel.

Commissioner Tremel said the only concern he has is the 50' buffer area. If the 50' is allowed to become retention it eliminate a great deal of the screening. He thinks item #3 is something that needs to be looked at and addressed.

Mr. West said staff's intent was to leave a natural buffer.

Commissioner Tremel said it doesn't say that. It says 50' wide upland buffer and they can get credit for some trees that are there. He would be more comfortable if is said something like a 50' natural buffer.

Mr. West said he would agree to insert the word "natural" before buffer and also include the prohibition of adult entertainment on the site.

Motion passed unanimously. (4-0)

VII. PLANNING MANAGER'S REPORT

There was no Planning Manager's Report at this time.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. West said that July 3rd is a regularly scheduled meeting and he asked if the Board wanted to move it to July 10th. There was no objection to moving it to July 10, 2002 at 7:00 p.m.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Fran Newborg, Recording Secretary

The public hearing minutes of the Seminole County Local Planning Agency/Planning and Zoning Commission is not a verbatim transcription. Recorded tapes of the public hearing can be made available, upon request, by contacting the Seminole County Planning Division Office, 1101 E. First Street, Sanford, Florida, 32771, (407) 665-7371.