

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF
THE SEMINOLE COUNTYLAND PLANNING AGENCY/
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2003
7:00 P.M.**

Members present: Alan Peltz, Dick Harris, Thomas Mahoney, Dudley Bates, Ben Tucker, Beth Hattaway

Also present: Jeff Hopper, Senior Planner, Kent Cichon, Financial Manager, Matthew West, Planning Manager, Karen Consalo, Deputy County Attorney, Rob Walsh, Principal Coordinator, Candace Lindlaw-Hudson, Senior Staff Assistant

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 P.M. by Commissioner Tucker who then explained to the audience the manner in which the meeting is to be conducted.

II. ROLL CALL

A quorum was established.

III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

**Commissioner Peltz nominated Commissioner Tucker as the Chairman.
Commissioner Hattaway seconded the nomination.**

Commissioner Mahoney nominated Commissioner Harris for Chairman.

The vote was 4 – 2 to retain Commissioner Tucker as the Chairman.

**Commissioner Harris nominated Commissioner Mahoney for Vice – Chairman.
Commissioner Peltz seconded.**

The vote was 6 – 0 to elect Commissioner Mahoney Vice Chairman.

IV. ACCEPTANCE OF PROOF OF PUBLICATION

**Commissioner Mahoney made the motion to accept the proof of publication.
Commissioner Hattaway seconded the motion.
Proof of publication was unanimously accepted.**

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of minutes was deferred until the March meeting.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

There was nothing under this category.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Kirtley Center; William Kirtley, applicant; rezone from M-1 (Industrial) to PCD (Planned Commercial District); 1.63 acres; 500 feet north of intersection of CR 427 & Longwood - Lake Mary Road, west side of Longwood-Lake Mary Road; (Z2002-109).
Commissioner Henley – BCC District 4

Jeff Hopper, Senior Planner

Jeff Hopper stated that a condition of approval would be to limit the use of the property to office/warehouse. In reviewing the staff report Mr. Hopper stated that parking was an issue. The offices were limited to 13,000 square feet. 63 parking spaces should be adequate. The balance of the space is for warehouse use. Changes in use will require changes in the PCD agreement with the Board of County Commissioners.

Representing the applicant was John Reynolds of American Civil Engineering Company. Mr. Reynolds agreed with the staff report except for condition number 6. He stated that he wanted 9 foot by 18 foot parking in the rear lot to save trees on the site. The tree survey did not reflect the placement of real trees. He stated that he will keep the 30 inch live oak north of the pond and several other oaks. The line was pulled back to save the trees after construction.

Commissioner Tucker asked about wheel stops in the front lot.

Mr. Reynolds stated that there were wheel stops with 2 feet in front and 16 feet behind.

Commissioner Mahoney said that the County had allowed smaller spaces to preserve trees in the past. The area would be primarily used for employees. The Commissioner then inquired how the entrance to Longwood Lake Mary Road had been changed.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the driveway had been shortened, making it perpendicular to the through lane.

No one spoke from the audience.

Mr. Clack's comments were read into the record. He stated that he had been told that he could not rezone the parcel next to the Jehovah Witness parcel (parcel to the north of this parcel). Mr. Clack said that he put in an application and was told that no commercial development would be allowed north of the 7-11 store.

Jeff Hopper pointed out that the Future Land Use for Mr. Clack's property is LDR.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to approve the application, with the change made to condition number 6, as requested by the applicant.

Commissioner Peltz seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 6 – 0.

B. GAP Housing Phase II; Sherri Fragomeni; approximately 7.0 acres; rezone from Agriculture (A-1) to Residential (R-3A) multiple-family dwelling district; one quarter mile north of Aloma Avenue on west side of Howell Branch Road (Z2002-110)

Commissioner Maloy – BCC District 1

Jeff Hopper, Senior Planner

Matt West stated that Staff had received a letter from the property owner asking for withdrawal of the application. He had since changed his mind and stated his intention to alter his application.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to continue the item for one month.

Commissioner Peltz seconded the motion.

The vote was 6 – 0 in favor of continuance.

C. E. Lake Brantley Drive PUD; Thomas Daly / Daly Design Group; 9.9 acres + 1,650 square feet; Small Scale Land Use Amendment from Planned Development (PD) to Low Density Residential (LDR) and Office to Planned Development; and Rezone from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to R-1A Single Family Dwelling district, and from Professional Office (OP) to PUD; to correct a previous error (08-02SS.02 and Z2002-018).

Commissioner Van Der Weide - District 3

Jeff Hopper, Senior Planner

Jeff Hopper stated that an error had been made on the zoning of a residential lot on Lake Gene Drive and that a small strip of land had been omitted from the original request for rezone on this item. An amended development order and corrected legal description are now included.

Commissioner Harris asked if the original document is being corrected to exclude the residential piece.

Mr. Hopper indicated that it is.

Thomas Daly, Daly Design Group, stated that he had been given an incorrect legal description by his client. The PSP would be presented in March.

Gladys Bernstein of 225 Shadowbay Boulevard South stated that she had not been informed of this meeting. Her concern was that there is emergency exit on East Lake Brantley Drive. She stated that the neighbors do not want this to be a regular entrance. This is a small, narrow road. Such a change would be detrimental to the Shadowbay neighborhood.

Mr. Hopper stated that the entrance is from Wekiva Springs Road as shown on the

map.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Mahoney made the motion to approve the request with the conditions listed in the Staff report.

Commissioner Harris seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 6 – 0.

D. **Seminole County And The City Of Sanford**; A proposed joint planning agreement between Seminole County and the City of Sanford for the purpose and intent of adopting standards and procedures to ensure that coordinated and cooperative planning activities are accomplished to guide urban expansion in a spirit of harmony and cooperation in matters relating to, but not limited to, planning, future development approvals, annexations, and land development regulations.

BCC Districts 2 and 5 – Commissioners Morris and McLain

Rob Walsh, Principal Coordinator

Matt West explained that there have been changes in the upper levels of government in the City of Sanford. Issues are still unresolved with the City. Will the City take over maintenance of the Celery Avenue corridor? Celery Avenue is capped off by the City at 6 units per acre. The County would like to see 3 units per acre.

Staff is requesting continuance to March 5.

Antoine Gurley, Principal Planner for the City of Sanford said that he would be meeting with the Staff on Friday.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to continue the item to the March 5 meeting.

Commissioner Harris seconded the motion.

The vote was 6 – 0 to continue this item until the March 5, 2003 meeting.

E. **Celery Avenue Administrative Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Seminole County**; Administrative Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment From Suburban Estates (SE) to Low Density Residential (LDR); Located on the north and south sides of Celery Avenue from the Sanford city limits on the west to a point west of Cameron Avenue. (02f.Adm01 and Z2002-017)

Commissioner McLain - District 5

Rob Walsh, Principal Coordinator

F. Celery Avenue Administrative Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Seminole County; Administrative Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Suburban Estates (SE) to Mixed Development (MXD); Located south of Celery Avenue, between SR 415 and approximately 1373 feet west of Cameron Avenue. (02f.Adm01 and Z2002-017)

Commissioner McLain - District 5

Rob Walsh, Principal Coordinator

Rob Walsh presented the background and history of the request. This matter was presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission at a special meeting on September 18, 2002. As of this date, the City and County have yet to agree on the density cap for the area or future maintenance responsibility for Celery Avenue. Mr. Walsh restated many of the issues included in the staff report.

The largest constraint to development is Celery Avenue itself. The road is operating at service level "A" but the road is considered substandard in terms of width and construction standards. Significant reconstruction will be required at some point in the future.

The proposed Sanford JPA could reduce the burdens to the roads and services in the area by capping the density at 3 dwelling units per acre, instead of the current 6 units per acre currently in the City of Sanford's plan.

Mr. Walsh concluded by stating that the planning staff recommends the transmittal to the Florida Department of Community Affairs of the administrative land use amendment from Suburban Estates to Low Density Residential for review. However, planning staff does not recommend adoption of the Low Density Residential land use until an interlocal agreement with the City of Sanford is approved by both jurisdictions, as detailed below, with findings that the Low Density Residential land use, as proposed, would be:

1. Consistent with Vision 2020 Plan policies, including policies related to the Low Density Residential land use designation; and
2. Compatible with adjacent Suburban Estates land use; and
3. An appropriate transitional use at this location; and
4. Consistent with the trends for the development of single family residential subdivisions along the Celery Avenue Corridor within the City of Sanford; and
5. The proposed Low Density Residential land use represents an orderly progression from developed areas from the west to the east.

Planning staff also recommends that the County and the City of Sanford adopt an interlocal agreement with the following conditions prior to the adoption of the administrative land use amendments:

1. A zoning overlay for the Celery Avenue Corridor is created and caps the residential density within Section One at 3 dwelling units per net buildable acre;
2. Require central water and sewer services for developments with an intensity greater than one dwelling unit per net buildable acre; and

3. The City of Sanford will assume the maintenance of Celery Avenue through the adoption of a separate interlocal agreement that will address the time and method of transfer.

This item is scheduled for BCC review on February 25, 2003 to consider transmittal to the Florida Department of Community Affairs, and again on June 10 for possible adoption.

Commissioner Tucker asked about the area in the northeast corner that showed some existing residential lots. Mr. Tucker showed an area that squared off around an area of Seminole Estates. He stated that the remaining undeveloped lots in that area would not be appropriate to include in this discussion.

The Commissioners had no questions at this point.

The first speaker from the audience was Cecelia Bonafy, an attorney for the Wilhelmina Meriwether Trust. She stated that her clients were in favor of this proposal.

The next speaker was Mr. William O. Vawter of 2201 Celery Avenue who wanted to know if there would be sidewalks on Celery Avenue. Mr. Vawter stated that before Thanksgiving there had been a child killed by a truck on Celery Avenue. He also stated that his lot had a flooding problem, as did other yards in the area. He has concerns with the drainage.

Janet Courtney spoke next, representing Jeno Paulucci, who owns 200 acres in the area north of zone one. Ms. Courtney stated that Mr. Paulucci is opposed to this. Capping intensities and densities should be part of a plan amendment, not in a Joint Plan, which is not even ready at this time. The Joint Planning Agreement is not a substitute for comprehensive planning. Chapter 163 also requires a complete application to be transmitted, and without the Joint Planning Agreement, you do not have a complete application to vote on. Lastly, Rule 9J5 is specific on what is to be included, including housing inventory and needs. This does not answer the questions: what is the current housing inventory need? When will it be used up? What is the vacant land need? What is the impact of developing this property? Is it really needed now?

Rob Walsh presented the background and history of the request. This matter was presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission at a special meeting on September 18, 2002. As of this date, the City and County have yet to agree on the density cap for the area or future maintenance responsibility for Celery Avenue. Mr. Walsh restated many of the issues included in the staff report.

The largest constraint to development is Celery Avenue itself. The road is operating at service level "A" but the road is considered substandard in terms of width and construction standards. Significant reconstruction will be required at some point in the future.

The proposed Sanford JPA could reduce the burdens to the roads and services in the area by capping the density at 3 dwelling units per acre, instead of the current 6 units

per acre currently in the City of Sanford's plan.

Mr. Walsh concluded by stating that the planning staff recommends the transmittal to the Florida Department of Community Affairs of the administrative land use amendment from Suburban Estates to Low Density Residential for review. However, planning staff does not recommend adoption of the Low Density Residential land use until an interlocal agreement with the City of Sanford is approved by both jurisdictions, as detailed below, with findings that the Low Density Residential land use, as proposed, would be:

1. Consistent with Vision 2020 Plan policies, including policies related to the Low Density Residential land use designation; and
2. Compatible with adjacent Suburban Estates land use; and
3. An appropriate transitional use at this location; and
4. Consistent with the trends for the development of single family residential subdivisions along the Celery Avenue Corridor within the City of Sanford; and
5. The proposed Low Density Residential land use represents an orderly progression from developed areas from the west to the east.

Planning staff recommends the transmittal to the Florida Department of Community Affairs of the administrative land use amendment from Suburban Estates to Mixed Development for review. However, Planning Staff does not recommend adoption of the Mixed Use Development land use until an interlocal agreement with the City of Sanford is approved by both jurisdictions as detailed below with findings that the Mixed Use Development, as proposed, would be:

1. Consistent with Vision 2020 Plan policies, including policies related to the Mixed Use Development land use designation; and
2. Compatible with adjacent Suburban Estates, Low Density Residential, and Industrial land uses; and
3. An appropriate transitional use at this location.

Planning staff also recommends that the County and the City of Sanford adopt an interlocal agreement with the following conditions prior to the adoption of the administrative land use amendments:

1. A zoning overlay for the Celery Avenue Corridor is created and caps the residential density within Section One at 3 dwelling units per net buildable acre;
2. Require central water and sewer services for developments with an intensity greater than one dwelling unit per net buildable acre; and
3. The City of Sanford will assume the maintenance of Celery Avenue through the adoption of a separate interlocal agreement that will address the time and method of transfer.

This item is scheduled for BCC review on February 25, 2003 to consider transmittal to the Florida Department of Community Affairs, and again on June 10 for possible adoption.

Commissioner Tucker asked about the area in the northeast corner that showed some existing residential lots. Mr. Tucker showed an area that squared off around an area of

Seminole Estates. He stated that the remaining undeveloped lots in that area would not be appropriate to include in this discussion.

The Commissioners had no questions at this point.

The first speaker from the audience was Cecelia Bonafy, an attorney for the Wilhelmina Meriwether Trust. She stated that her clients were in favor of this proposal.

The next speaker was Mr. William O. Vawter of 2201 Celery Avenue who wanted to know if there would be sidewalks on Celery Avenue. Mr. Vawter stated that before Thanksgiving there had been a child killed by a truck on Celery Avenue. He also stated that his lot had a flooding problem, as did other yards in the area. He has concerns with the drainage.

Janet Courtney spoke next, representing Jeno Paulucci, who owns 200 acres in the area north of zone one. Ms. Courtney stated that Mr. Paulucci is opposed to this. Capping intensities and densities should be part of a plan amendment, not in a Joint Plan, which is not even ready at this time. The Joint Planning Agreement is not a substitute for comprehensive planning. Chapter 163 also requires a complete application to be transmitted, and without the Joint Planning Agreement, you do not have a complete application to vote on. Lastly, Rule 9J5 is specific on what is to be included, including housing inventory and needs. This does not answer the questions: what is the current housing inventory need? When will it be used up? What is the vacant land need? What is the impact of developing this property? Is it really needed now?

Roger Neiswinder, 516 Lakeview Street, Orlando, representing Jeno Paulucci spoke next. He stated that Mr. Paulucci takes exception to this proposal. He objects in particular to one underlying presumption relative to the land use of the area. The County is making the assumption that the area is monolithic. There are large parcels in the west, with small parcels as one moves east. On intersections there are small, densely set houses, close to the road. In the area of Brisson to Sipes there are many changes. This has not been thoroughly examined. Out parcels have been left out on the east end. The southern mixed use area could have 20 units per acre in a multi-family configuration. Roadway in the area is a 20 foot right of way. Today the minimum standard is 24 feet, plus drainage and sidewalks. Typically, that is 70 feet of right of way. Existing structures prohibit road growth. A proposed trailhead needs more space. The \$2.5 million allotted is inadequate. There are therefore planning reasons why the County should cut at Sipes Avenue and retain suburban estates to the east of Sipes. Mr. Neiswinder concluded by saying that it is premature to proceed with this at this time. Mr. Paulucci is concerned about the land use compatibility, particularly the MDX area.

Becky Mizell of 2790 Celery Avenue stated that the new homes in the area looked nice, but there is a serious drainage problem in the area for existing homes. She stated that there should be no development past Brisson Street. Stop signs should be put at Sipes and on Brisson. If the road is widened, the sidewalks will wind up on the front porches of the existing homes. This area was meant to be rural. The problems at hand should be fixed before proposing further development. She also had a question about an area that she thought was conservation area which has several large buildings on it

belonging to Bit and Bridle area owners. How did they get to build on a conservation area?

John Russell of 950 Powhatan Drive stated that he was concerned with the east boundary of Area One. Indian Mound Village is divided by an easement, a one lane paved road. The Roseman's is divided in half by this east boundary. Mr. Russell stated that the boundary should be moved west of his property so that the property is not divided.

Mr. Kent McIntosh of 951 Powhatan Drive stated that he was opposed. He has come to seven meetings. His home is 15 feet east of the boundary of Area One. He has appeared before the P&Z and BCC seven times concerning this matter. He stated that the objective of his area commissioner is to maintain the rural character of our district. Mr. McIntosh wants the area to remain suburban estates. Previously he has raised the problems of traffic matters, drainage, utilities, the Joint Planning Amendment and the Joint Planning Agreement. He has never been asked to participate in any phase of this process by any group or County staff member.

Commissioner Hattaway had asked about trends in the area at a previous meeting. In response, Mr. McIntosh then showed photos showing what has happened in Zone One since August 1, 2000. He showed how Celery Avenue is a 20 foot wide path that has not changed since 1968. He also showed pictures of an area which he called "the experiment station" which the County is going to acquire.

Mr. McIntosh also showed photographs in the corridor as examples of suburban estates. Several homes have been restored or repainted, but no other construction has occurred since August 1, 2000 in Zone One.

Mr. McIntosh showed his property in Zone Two. He stated that Zone Two has a few businesses and uses today: a home business, a flower farm, a small industrial business, the First Pentecostal Church, a marina, an aluminum extrusion business, Mr. McIntosh's farm and 5 permanent residences. Zone two has 3 main owners, the Hooks, the Andres, The Pentecostal Church, and Mr. McIntosh. These people do not want changes in the Celery corridor.

The public hearing portion of this item was then closed.

Commissioner Tucker asked Mr. West to address the issue of drainage and sidewalks.

Mr. West pointed out that the original questions on the lots that were divided by the district line are already zoned LDR in the east side.

Commissioner Hattaway asked about changing the land use designation of the area so that it is the same.

Commissioner Tucker stated that there are only a few lots that have yet to be developed. He saw no reason why the line could not be moved to the western edge.

Mr. West stated that when the process started two years ago, a large block of land which was County has since been annexed. Several subdivisions are planned in Sanford. A church is also planning to go in the area and be annexed into the City. Do we want this to be annexed and be developed without a plan? The Comprehensive Plan is based on a 20 year window. This area is designated as an urban area near the airport and City.

Commissioner Hattaway asked about the people and houses that are already out there.

Mr. West stated that different things can be done, such as designing a road to pass around a property, or the County could move the houses. The County has a concurrency management system that will address the timing of widening of the road. We are talking about a 20 year land use plan. Concurrency is instituted when development permits are pulled.

The study of how much housing was available showed a build out date for the County of 2017. At our present rate, the numbers are being changed with a residential absorption rate study which could indicate a residential build out date sooner than 2017.

We have an international airport, SR 46 which is developing and creating employment opportunities, and a revitalizing downtown area in Sanford, all of which demand a place for workers to live in proximity to their jobs. We also have the non residential land uses.

Mr. West said that he will have to check into the barns in the conservation areas of Bit and Bridle.

The arguments to put the mixed uses at the end would provide transition near the Stenstrom Bridge.

Mr. West acknowledged that Celery Avenue is substandard. The County will work with the City of Sanford on improvements. The better way is to plan it comprehensively and determine the impacts, making a uniform program.

Commissioner Tucker asked if the County was working on the 4 laning of SR46.

Mr. West stated that there are monthly meetings on accelerating the project on SR 46.

Commissioner Tucker inquired about the eventual use of the Club Two borrow pit next to Midway.

Mr. West stated that as they draw to a close they will have to provide sloping and vegetation on the sides after they pull the fill out.

Commissioner Tucker asked if the pit could be used for retention.

Mr. West said that he did not know.

Commissioner Tucker asked about the purchase of the Experimental Station and that area being used for retention.

Mr. West did not know the status of the project, but he say that the County is trying to get some type of storm water pond out there.

Commissioner Hattaway asked if the County was putting together a piecemeal application as suggested earlier.

Mr. West stated that this amendment is being processed no differently from other amendments.

Mr. McIntosh stated in rebuttal to Mr. West's remarks that the parcel known as Celery Farms is annexed into the City of Sanford and zoned for 3 units per acre development. Also, he mentioned the 10 acre parcel belonging to Victory Deliverance, Inc. This parcel is not contiguous and is a serpentine annexation. In the east zone the marina is not in either zone, and is serviced by the Douglas Stenstrom Bridge. Another area of concern is Indian Mound Village, Inc., incorporated in 1926. In the Sanford Trails area there is no illegal intrusion into wetlands. To his knowledge, there has been no indication from anyone as to what will be done with the area known as "The Sand Mine" after it has been used. The Joint Planning Agreement stipulated consideration of the Celery Avenue corridor, which originally included the Midway area. After a vote at a community meeting (376 – 1) the Midway area was taken out of the corridor of consideration. Mr. McIntosh stated that this was a violation of the original JPA agreement.

Dr. Robert Roseman, a 44 year resident of Indian Mound Village, stated that in 1960 and as recently as 2 years ago, his lot and others near him, are under water. He wanted Mr. West to delineate where the wetlands are. The lot west of his is under water.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that there had been good presentations at this meeting. Mr. McIntosh showed the development trend in area one. Commissioner Mahoney stated that we would not see small lots and small houses because it is inappropriate to the Land Use. There is also a trend of serial annexation by the City of Sanford, marching eastward. In the absence of a land use amendment tethered to a joint agreement with the City, development will continue with the City's terms, rather than the County. Because of this, Commissioner Mahoney stated that he was in support of the land use amendments before the Board. The primary reason is so that the County can negotiate with the City to lessen density, raise standards for sidewalks and trail development. Without this, the trend of development at 6 units per acre will continue.

Commissioner Mahoney made the motion pertaining to Area One to recommend to the BCC that they transmit to the Department of Community Affairs the land use amendment from Suburban Estates to Low Density Residential in that the adoption of that land use amendment be contingent upon the adoption of a Joint Planning Agreement with the City of Sanford.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Harris stated that this is perhaps the most difficult area in the entire County. Mr. Neiswinder is perhaps correct in saying that the area east of Sipes Avenue is potentially, fundamentally different from the area to the west. Seminole Estates may be a development that stops the annexation by the City, unless it moves along the southside of Celery Avenue and then jumps over to the north part. The development is being driven by low interest rates at unforeseen levels. Across the river in western Volusia County is also huge. The pressure to widen 415 and to bring an extension of the Greenway north. Matt West is looking at a 20 year horizon. This view is a fundamentally different from the citizen groups, since it has a 20 year view and a future land use map. The change in the character of the area depends on what the property owners choose to do. Looking at the large lot at the corner of Celery and Sipes (on the SE corner) that is a large parcel that could be potentially developed into a subdivision, the others will be made into subdivisions only if a developer comes along and convinces enough parcel owners to sell out so that the parcels can be combined to make a parcel big enough to make a subdivision. In August it became apparent that letting the existing JPA continue would lead to development of greater density.

Commissioner Tucker stated that compromise was needed. Celery Avenue needs to be improved. The northeast section should be kept Suburban Estates through negotiations with the City of Sanford.

Commissioner Harris stated that in the past large-lot enclaves provided diversity. On the north side of Oviedo there is an enclave of 10 acre lots. The question is: Will it work in this area when the lots change hands in the future? Staff is correct to negotiate down density. This area is not monolithic.

There is an area of similar types of lots north of Celery and Sipes and another west of Sipes and Celery with smaller lots. Sipes Avenue could be the dividing line.

Commissioner Bates asked if annexation is voluntary in respect to the property owner.

Commissioner Tucker stated that the City has the option.

Matt West stated that the state is examining the topic of annexation now. There are ways to annex involuntarily. Sanford is working on voluntary annexation of tracts.

Commissioner Bates stated that the County is trying to hold annexation to 3 units per acre. We assume the land will be passed to new owners who may want to redevelop the property.

Commissioner Tucker commented that most people want to keep the land.

Commissioner Bates stated that the next generation may want to change. We do not want that, but there are development pressures.

Commissioner Tucker stated that things in the City could change.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that executive order cannot impose policy.

Commissioner Tucker stated that he believed that the board was split at this time on this issue.

Commissioner Hattaway made a motion to hold off and not transmit until issues of density have been resolved.

Commissioner Bates seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that he was opposed.

Commissioner Peltz stated that he was opposed.

The vote was 3 to 3 (tie) on the motion, with Commissioners Tucker, Hattaway and Bates approving, and Commissioners Harris, Peltz, and Mahoney opposing.

Commissioner Mahoney made the motion that the Board transmit Section One to the BCC without recommendation.

Commissioner Harris seconded the motion and said that he saw no consensus on this.

The vote was 5 to 1 to transmit section one without recommendation. Commissioner Peltz was the dissenting vote.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to transmit section two to the BCC without recommendation.

Commissioner Mahoney seconded the motion.

The vote was 5 to 1 to transmit the second part to the BCC without recommendation. The dissenting vote was cast by Commissioner Peltz.

G. **Ordinance** allowing P&D Director to grant lot size / width variance if within 3% of required size or width. This ordinance will implement Policy FLU 5.19 of the Future Land Use Element of the County's Comprehensive Plan as amended on 08/13/02.

Countywide

Dick Boyer, Senior Planner

Matt West stated that the lot size and width ordinance had been requested by the BCC. In rural areas there are some lots with less than required size, such as 9.98 acres, and are therefore unbuildable.

The Planning Director will have some leverage within 3 percent. The Sustainable Communities Advisory Counsel want to make it the 8 conditions listed herein only. The Counsel wanted to restrict things to the already created lots. The lot buildability form will be revised. If Don Fisher declines a De Minimis lot application, the decision can be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Bates asked why 3 percent was chosen.

Mr. West answered that it represented a small amount.

Mr. Sam Kendall of Altamonte Springs asked if 4 percent could be appealed.

Commissioner Tucker said that it could be.

Commissioner Harris made the motion to approve the request.

Commissioner Peltz seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 6 – 0.

H. **Energy Element; Seminole County;** Proposed Addition Of An Energy Element To The Seminole County Comprehensive Plan (Vision 2020).

(03s.Txt01)

Countywide

Alice Gilmartin, Principal Coordinator

Matt West stated that the BCC had directed the promotion of conservation in methods of operation and in facilities of the County. We may be the first county in Florida to do this. This is being done with the design of the new courthouse and in the use of hybrid vehicles.

Commissioner Mahoney requested that the text be reviewed for clarity prior to passing it on to the BCC.

Sam Kendall of Altamonte Springs asked how much energy is used in the county? Florida Power can tell us that. How many BTU's are expended and how much was spent on energy? Consider electric, natural gas and gasoline use.

How much personal income is devoted to energy? If we reduce this figure, that would leave more expendible income to spend on the county itself.

Mr. Kendall suggested that we should look for ways to produce energy.

We should look for trends and determine progress as time goes on.

In Policy EOG.2.2 sharing of data with power companies is proposed.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that this information is useful, but it could not be used at this time. We should look in to these ideas.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to adopt this element to the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan.

Dudley Bates seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 6 – 0.

VIII PLANNING MANAGER'S REPORT

Matt West stated that the Myrtle Street study would be discussed at the February 19, 2003 special meeting.

IX OTHER BUSINESS

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 P.M.