

**AGENDA MINUTES
CITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET
MONDAY, JUNE 23, 2025 5:30 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, June 23, 2025, at Leesburg City Hall. Mayor Reisman called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present:

Commissioner Allyson Berry
Commissioner Jimmy Burry
Commissioner Jay Connell
Commissioner Mike Pederson
Mayor Alan Reisman

Also present, were City Manager (CM) Al Minner, City Clerk (CC) J. Andi Purvis, City Attorney (CA) Grant Watson, Deputy City Clerk (DCC) Anna Rottermond, the news media, and others.

INVOCATION

The invocation and Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag were performed at the Carver Heights Montclair Area CRA meeting held just prior to this meeting.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2. PROCLAMATIONS:

A. Pride Month

Mayor Reisman read a proclamation proclaiming the month of June 2025 as Pride Month and encouraged everyone to reflect on the ways we can all live together through mutual consideration, respect, and understanding.

3. PRESENTATIONS:

A. Recognize K9 Officer Joe Heuser and K9 Nick

Mayor Reisman said he was proud to highlight a major achievement by two outstanding members of the Leesburg Police Department, Senior Officer Heuser and his K9 partner Nick. This evening was a celebration of their second place overall finish at the Treasure Coast Police K9 Competition. It was an

impressive accomplishment at one of the most competitive K9 events in the region. It was his pleasure to attend this event and witness firsthand the level of precision, discipline, and professionalism required to compete. Senior Officer Heuser and K9 Nick stood out among top law enforcement agencies from across Florida and other states, making this recognition all the more meaningful. Their performance reflects the excellence they bring to our community every day through patrol work, narcotics detection, and the unwavering commitment to public safety. We are incredibly proud of their achievement and equally proud of all the men and women at the Leesburg Police Department who serve this city with integrity, courage, and heart. On behalf of the City of Leesburg, City Commission and all the residents of Leesburg, thank you. He presented them with a plaque in their honor.

Police Chief (PC) Iozzi thanked the commission for recognizing Senior Officer Heuser and K9 Nick. They competed in several competitions, and they did very well. They exhibited everything that we hoped our K9 unit would show. With all the hard work and effort that they put in, they are a force multiplier to any organization. They do a lot of great work for our city. Thank you to the commission for your support of the police department and, in particular, tonight, for the K9 unit.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

This section is reserved for members of the public to bring up matters of concern or opportunities for praise. Please note that issues raised during this time will not be discussed in detail during the current meeting. They will either be referred to the appropriate staff or scheduled for consideration at a future City Commission Meeting. Each speaker is allocated three minutes to provide their comments. Kindly adhere to this time limit to ensure equal opportunity for all participants and to support the efficient conduct of the meeting. Thank you!

Members of the Leesburg Shuffleboard Club, Richard Tallman, Gail Howell, Carol Helfer, Jacob Sokol and Al Dronsfield all spoke about the need to resurface the shuffleboard courts located at Woodward and Palmetto Streets. They came to ask for the city's help to resurface the courts before they are ruined. The shuffleboard courts have deteriorated to the point that the finish comes off when they sweep. They would not be able to use these courts in an international competition. The courts need to be redone prior to their season starting October 1, 2025. That is when their season meets start. The courts cannot be done afterward that date for at least six months. The cost to resurface is \$22,000. They would also like to have roofs put over the courts, new restrooms, and the ceiling fixed in the director's office.

Carolyn Colucci, a resident of the Plantation development, said the development next to them, Manor Oak, wants to use their roads for emergency services because they only have one entrance. If an ambulance needs to get in and if the traffic is backed up on CR 33, they are screwed. They do have the opportunity to use the causeway underneath the electrical lines, but they want to use our development and that is not fair. They need to figure out how to get emergency personnel in there. The communities being built around them are imposing upon them and impacting their safety and resources. That is poor planning by the developer and the city. The traffic alone is horrible. It takes longer to get anywhere. It would be helpful if there was an updated development map, because when she asked for a map, she got one that was over three years old. **Mayor Reisman** pointed out that there is a development map on the city website that includes all the commercial and residential growth. **CM Minner** added that the map is updated for all developments that come in, and it can be found on the city website. As far as the emergency entrance, the planning and zoning director was in attendance, and he would be able to address those concerns. That emergency ingress/egress into the Plantation will not move forward because that proposed subdivision has a boulevard entry, and there is an exception to the rule on that.

Deborah Frett of 1205 Susan Street said there were previous discussions about putting sidewalks along Susan Street. She was curious if they would be on both sides of the street because she could not imagine that happening. They do not really need sidewalks, they need speed bumps. There is a curve in the road right at her property and distracted drivers have already knocked her mailbox down three or four times. Just this weekend there was a four-car accident because of distracted driving. She asked that the commission consider speed bumps. They asked for speed bumps four or five years ago, and they received an email saying it was not in the budget. However, she would like the city to consider speed bumps. If she had a choice between the speed bumps and the sidewalk, she would rather have the speed bumps, especially with the new sports complex coming up. **CM Minner** said the sidewalks were a CDBG application. He was not sure which sidewalks they were, but the grant application is pending. He asked that she speak with the public works director in the back of the room about the speed bumps.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:

Routine items are placed on the Consent Agenda to expedite the meeting. If the Commission/Staff wish to discuss any item, the procedure is as follows: (1) pull the item(s) from the Consent Agenda; (2) vote on remaining items with one roll call vote, (3) discuss each pulled item and vote by roll call

Commissioner Pederson moved to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented, and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the Consent Agenda, as follows:
(Each item has its coordinated resolution number listed below the header)

A. CITY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES:

- 1. None**

B. PURCHASING ITEMS:

- 1. Purchase request for one (1) Aluminum Biosolids Trailer for the amount of \$77,423.00 from Mac Trailer Manufacturing, Inc., contract holder for Sourcewell contract # 092922-MCT.**
- 2. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Construction Services Agreement with GSB Construction & Development, Inc. for the construction of the Venetian Cove Marina Facility; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,048

3. **Ratification request of the purchase and installation of two (2) new 12.5-ton Honeywell HVAC units and one (1) air handler for the Leesburg Police Department's first floor. Due to the urgent need to restore climate control within the facility, the equipment was procured from Garden City Westbrook Holdco, LLC, for the amount of \$117,463.51.**
4. **Ratification request of the emergency purchase and installation of one (1) 12.5-ton Carrier HVAC unit and one (1) 15-ton Trane split system for the Leesburg Resource Center. Due to the urgent need to restore climate control within the facility and maintain essential community services, the replacement equipment was procured from Garden City Westbrook Holdco, LLC, for the amount of \$137,655.48.**

C. RESOLUTIONS:

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Leesburg Fire Department to apply for, and if awarded, accept the Firehouse Subs Public Safety Grant, for an amount not to exceed \$45,000, for the purchase of rescue and extrication equipment; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,049

2. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement affecting the property described therein from Salvador Salazar Rosado, joined by Raudel Torres; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,050

3. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing a Revised Highway Maintenance Agreement with FDOT for maintenance of US 441 and US 27 right of way in Leesburg; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,051

4. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Electric Service Agreement between the City of Leesburg and Burgland LH Sleepy Hollow LLC., regarding electric service to a development known as Sunnyside Reserve; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,052

5. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Gas Service Agreement between the City of Leesburg and Cedar Landings LP, regarding natural gas service to the development known as Blue Cedar Phase 2; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,053

6. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to participate in the Non-Motorized Traffic Monitoring Program in order to collect and maintain statistically valid bicycle and pedestrian volume on the Lee-Wild Trail; and provide an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,054

7. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Gas Service Agreement between the City of Leesburg and Forestar Group, Inc., regarding natural gas service to the development known as Orange Bend Ranch - Spine Road Main; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,055

8. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Gas Service Agreement between the City of Leesburg and Forestar Group, Inc., regarding natural gas service to the development known as Orange Bend Ranch Pods 3 & 4; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,056

6. **PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:**
During Public Hearings and Non-Routine Items, the Commission requests that those in attendance respect the process and maintain order. As such, in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, please refrain from speaking out, cheering, or applauding during these proceedings. Your cooperation helps ensure a fair and respectful hearing.
 - A. **SECOND READING OF ORDINANCES:**
 1. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real

property consisting of approximately 8.77 +/- acres; and being generally located east of US Highway 27 and north of Magnolia Avenue, lying in Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; providing that said property so annexed shall be liable for its proportionate share of the existing and future indebtedness of said city; providing that such annexed property shall be subject to all laws and ordinances of said city as if all such territory had been a part of the City of Leesburg at the time of passage and approval of said laws and ordinances; providing that such annexed territory shall be placed in City Commission District 3; and providing an effective date. (Venice at Lake Harris ANNX)

DENIED ORDINANCE 25-29

Mayor Reisman asked the city attorney to perform the swearing-in ceremony. **CA Watson** asked anyone wishing to present any testimony or evidence on second reading items; 6.A.3, the Venice at Lake Harris SPUD; 6.A.6, the BarKey II PUD; and 6.A.9, the Richey Road Rezoning or first reading item 6.B.3, the Lake Margareta PUD to stand and raise their right hand. He swore them all in.

Commissioner Pederson introduced ordinances 6.A.1, 6.A.2, and 6.A.3 to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinances by title only.

Commissioner Burry made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated the overall proposal consists of 8.7 plus or minus acres. It is generally located east of U.S. Highway 27 north of Magnolia and south of Corley Island Road. The request is for an annexation, small-scale comprehensive plan amendment, and rezoning. The future land use would go from Lake County Urban Low to City of Leesburg Low Density. The zoning would go from Lake County C-1, which is neighborhood commercial and R-6 Urban Residential, to the City of Leesburg SPUD (Small Planned Unit Development). They are requesting a future development of twenty-six attached single-family units, which are town houses and a commercial area on the west side along US 27. Under the PUD requirements, there would be twenty-six attached town houses with a two-floor maximum height. An area of commercial development that would be contiguous to US 27 would include approximately 21,000 square feet of retail uses. There are no other permitted uses in the proposal. All residential units would be rear-loaded, meaning the garage would be on the back side of the home. That would give a shorter front setback that could be used in the design. The townhouse units would be twenty feet in width with one thousand feet minimum size and two off-street parking spaces for each unit. Extra spaces are also provided in the concept plan. There are design and architectural standards required, which would apply. There are five features that must be selected from a list provided in the planned unit development. Dark sky lighting is required. There is significant buffering to the adjacent properties as provided in the site plan in the PUD with a twenty-five-foot buffer tract around the property. There is a forty-foot buffer required on the south side of the property. Landscape buffers would not be part of the lots. They are separate and must be maintained by the HOA. They should not be maintained individually. There would be a six-and-a-half-foot privacy fence provided adjacent to the parcels on the northern and eastern boundaries unless the vegetation is opaque. In other words, you would not be able to see through it, and it would be of comparable height. We are requiring Bahia or Bermuda grass, with one tree between each lot because these are town houses. There would be signage consisting of a decorative entryway feature no greater than five feet in height on the entryway. Under recreation, there is a requirement for 5,200 square

feet to be devoted to a separate recreation area that would have various amenities, such as a pool, playground, trails, dog park, pavilion, etc. The recreation area must be constructed at the time the thirteenth unit is completed. That would be 50% of the residential structures. Finally, we have the standard phasing clause which allows four years to reach substantial commencement, or it would automatically revert to the RE-1 zoning standards, which is one acre per unit. The entire development would be on city water and wastewater. The Lake County Public Works provided their comments, which included a drainage and flood study, storm water management basin study, and a traffic study. They also requested that the applicant meet with Lake County Public Works. We did receive significant public response to this request as a part of the original notice that was sent out to the surrounding property owners, and that included advertisements. Summarizing those comments, they included concerns regarding the wetlands present on the site, flooding, water contamination, trees, traffic and wildlife. That was just a summary. The residents also provided a petition of approximately eighty signatures and that was included in the commission packet. Staff requested the applicant to conduct a neighborhood meeting to speak with the neighbors. Staff wanted to thank the neighbors and the applicant for participating in that. The applicant has a presentation and the neighbors do have comments. Logan Opsahl of Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster, Kantor & Reed out of Orlando was present to answer any of the questions. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the planning and zoning director.

Commissioner Connell wanted to know what the planning commission's recommendation was. **PZD Miller** responded that the planning commission recommended denial with a two to five vote.

Logan Opsahl of Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster, Kantor & Reed, 215 North Yola Drive, said he wanted to touch on some of the specific details, particularly from the neighborhood meeting, along with some of the changes that were made in light of that meeting. Referring to the slides, he showed the subject property. It is an assemblage and the planning and zoning director previously noted that there was some split zoning, although there is consistent future land use in Lake County. Looking at the future land use map, this is urban low density, which is consistent with the surrounding area. There is an urban medium across the street, and some denser development to the south. Currently, the county zoning designations are C-1 and R-6, which are consistent with what is around in the area. They were there asking from a virtually identical entitlement standpoint to go from unincorporated Lake County to the City of Leesburg. Of course, they were also there because of the Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ISBA), which designates this property as one that could be annexed into the city for the provision of utilities. What is being accomplished through the PUD process is a mixed-use of C-1 Retail Commercial and R-6 zoning. Also, they are now only proposing a total of twenty-six residential units. In Lake County, the underlying future land use designation is R-6, which caps them at four units an acre and today what is being proposed equates to 2.96 units an acre with a commercial component that is consistent with what they see today.

He showed a rendering of the previous concept plan that was not being proposed tonight. The rendering showed what they proposed at the neighborhood meeting while working with city staff. The town homes equated to forty-six units and it had a smaller retail component. Through discussions with city staff and from what they heard at the neighborhood meeting, they came back with a reduction in the unit counts. What they heard consistently through the neighborhood meeting, first reading, and from city staff, was that they wanted retail. They understand that along US 27 there is a significant amount of commercial, but this will be more of a retail component. They are also proposing an approximate 40% reduction in units, which would allow for twenty-six town homes. He showed a slide of the proposed development. He pointed out that there was open water that connects to Lake Harris. This development would offer an improvement to that. There is a significant retention pond on the northern portion of the property to accommodate any flooding or runoff of storm water as required by the city code. He noted that it would allow the retention of a lot of natural vegetation and buffering, particularly on the east side, which is

where the recreation would be. There is a tree preservation area which is pretty heavily wooded. As the planning and zoning director mentioned in his presentation, they would maintain that vegetation or provide a fence. Another thing they heard consistently was that the surrounding residents would like to preserve as much of the vegetation as possible to allow for a natural buffer. There would be significant buffering and a lot of capacity for stormwater and open water, which US 27 drains into. He asked Mitch Collins, the project engineer, to talk about the retention pond and the open water area. More specifically, he wanted him to go over some of the concerns they heard about flooding and runoff.

Mitch Collins of 801 East South Street, Orlando, said he was the project engineer. He wanted to give a broad overview of some of the permitting requirements that would need to be worked through in order to get this project under construction. This project was a bit unusual in the amount of permitting, and site-related permitting that would be required. Looking specifically at stormwater, there are two local agencies, two state agencies and one federal agency that would have to review the project. Again, that is just for the stormwater. City staff would review it to make sure that the pond is large enough and that it does not affect any existing drainage patterns for neighboring properties. The Lake County Public Works would have to review the project due to the driveway on Magnolia and the stormwater work along with any modifications to the canal. There is a requirement to have a St John's River Water Management District permit. So, they will review the project as far as stormwater drainage as well as any wetland impacts. There is a Department of Transportation permit that is needed for any impacts on the canal. They would also need a permit for any ponds that drain into the department. However, in this case, the department is draining into us on its way to Lake Harris. They have already had meetings with them and this would be a very complicated and detailed review. If everything goes fine with that, there would also be some flood zone impacts which would require approval by FEMA, so that would be another federal agency. In total, there would be five agencies reviewing this project. If they are fortunate enough to move forward tonight, he would assure them that there would be several agencies reviewing the project with specific regard to the stormwater.

Mr. Opsahl appreciated that outline because a lot of permitting does go into these types of developments. They know and expect that for a project of this caliber, especially in this particular area. They were there asking for annexation to avail them of city codes, requirements and design standards. They were proud to have reached a successful resolution by working with the city staff and the neighbors. At this stage, this is the concept plan, the unit count, and the layout that they would be committed to build. As they move forward to engineering, they have full confidence in city staff, third-party consultants and the federal and state agencies to effectuate a fully engineered plan that handles the stormwater runoff for the site and for the area that was outlined by the project engineer. Referring to the proposed concept plan, the residential and commercial units will be no larger than two stories. He showed more detail about the layout of the parking lot and where things would be located. He showed some future land use and zoning maps for reference. He provided a slide that outlined what they have been able to achieve after hearing some of the concerns. He was sure they would hear some of those concerns tonight from the surrounding residents. The project would include two phases: the retail/commercial component and the town home residential component. The initial proposal consisted of forty-two town homes, but tonight they are only asking for twenty-six. That is a 40% reduction with significant buffering, setbacks, landscaping, preservation of natural vegetation and, of course, the retention and improvements to the open water for the stormwater. It included an expansion of the retail/commercial component to better service the area. That was done due to the feedback received from both residents and the city. This equates to a big reduction in density to under three from 4.79. Again, Lake County would allow four dwelling units an acre and what they are proposing is to go from County C-1 to City Urban Low, which is a reduction in density for both commercial and residential areas. They are also achieving significant setbacks while meeting the minimum of 35% open space. He provided a conceptual rendering of the town homes, which are the residential component. It included some unique architectural details that meet or exceed city codes. The

commercial build-out concept plan shows the elevations for what would be constructed on US 27. There was recommended approval from city staff. They changed and did a number of things while working through this process, which has taken them over a year. They worked with city staff to include and provide a recreational area, tree preservation and extensive buffering, a reduction in units by approximately 40%, improvement to the open water and the canal that will allow for better flow. There would be a boat ramp to accommodate kayaks only; there would be no motorboats, along with improvements to the open water and retention pond area to alleviate some of the flooding that may happen during a hurricane. This project kept all of those capacities in mind. This would include full amenities with a small trail and a courtyard. They have been able to accomplish a number of things. He thanked city staff for their resources and the public for coming out. He asked that they reserve some time for him to respond to any public comments. **Mayor Reisman** thanked him and asked if there were any questions for the developer.

Commissioner Pederson mentioned that during the first reading they heard a lot of comments about the wetlands and drainage concerns, but he did not think everybody understood the process even though it was touched on some tonight. This is required to go through the St John Watershed along with a lot of other agencies. He knows the commission will hear the opposite of that from the public. It may be something the developer includes in his wrap-up. He understands projects have to be self-contained, and this is a low-lying area. However, he does have concerns, but that really is not his role. He was not there to manage the wetlands because other agencies handle that.

Mr. Opsahl replied that he was happy he brought that up because it was open water. We understand the topography is rather low in relation and open water will remain. There may be some impacts on the wetland area around the water, but most open water has wetlands surrounding them. He asked Mr. Collins to briefly talk about self-containing drainage. **Mr. Collins** stated of the five agencies that review this, when FEMA reviews, they will look at flood zone issues. So basically, the city, the county, FDOT, and especially St John's review it. The two main items they will look for are that we are retaining the storm water because we have to retain it before it outfalls onto someone else. The second item would be that we are not affecting any existing drainage patterns to any neighbors. Both of those items will be looked at by four different agencies, but primarily St John's and Lake County. Those are the two main things that they will have to adhere to and that will be reviewed by several groups. They will be looked at by two local agencies, two state agencies and FEMA. Four agencies will be looking to make sure we are providing enough stormwater management facilities on site. We have to make sure that we do not affect any existing drainage patterns for any upstream or downstream neighboring properties. **Mayor Reisman** thanked him for those comments. He asked for public comments.

The following public participants spoke in opposition to the proposed development:

Michelle Norve of 4243 Corley Island Road	Lauren Lon of 29213 South Corley Island Road
Victoria Williams of 4227 Corley Island Road	Mark Staehler of 4246 Lansden Lane
Jamie Queen-Roosevelt of 29411 Jesses Lane	Angie Liston of 29213 South Corley Island Road
Diane Kelley of 29220 South Corley Island Road	

Mayor Reisman asked if there were any other public comments. There were none. He closed public comments. He asked the developer if he wanted to speak to the concerns of the public.

Mr. Opsahl said there was a portion of the roadway that was indicated as a private roadway with an easement. That would not be impacted by this development. He wanted to state that on the record for everyone's comfort level. They would not interfere with that road in this development. In fact, there is a

legally binding document that runs along the land that allows access to those roadways, but they would not interfere with that area. If it was helpful, they could make that as an additional condition to ensure that it would not be interfered with. With the fencing that was mentioned, the tree preservation area is heavily wooded, and it was his understanding that the trees were preferred. They would not interfere with that by virtue of installing fencing. However, he believes the PUD ordinance accomplishes that already. However, if they want to put in that fencing be a requirement in that area in addition to tree preservation, they would be in agreement with that. There was talk about flooding, but they have to remember they are mandated to accommodate flow both before and after. They addressed the topo and the history lesson was really enlightening that it was previously drained, but to be clear, there is a significant portion of this property that is upland and that is where they plan to put the residential units. He noted that there were some wetland areas around the open water and all of it would have to be fully permitted. They are required to go through all the proper jurisdictions and permitting agencies. That open water area would remain, and it would be improved in order to allow for the flow of water into the drainage basin and the open water. Actually, the surrounding area would benefit from that and, particularly, in instances like a hurricane, because it would allow it to flow. It would be fully engineered in the following conditions. Again, they are legally required to do so. With phasing and access around Corley Island Road. The infrastructure would begin on a horizontal basis, so they would accommodate the access roads. First, if we need to come up with a condition that relates to access, they are comfortable with that. We do not want to disrupt the neighborhood and more, particularly, the folks that have lived there for decades. He thanked everyone for their feedback because these are items they could address. Yes, this is a unique project, but there is an interlocal agreement that was negotiated by the city and the county which allows for the provision of utilities here. The silver lining in all that is that we avail ourselves of city performance standards, design criteria along with the requirements and the conditions that are in the PUD along with the ones offered, to make sure we are providing the best project we can. This would not have a lot of concrete, because we are allowing for the preservation of tree areas, open water and a retention pond. This project is unique because there is no agricultural land. They are not creating entitlements out of nowhere. This is zoned commercial, and it is zoned R-6 in the county. What they are providing is the same development program but with far less density. They are to city standards and requirements. No matter what the outcome is today, those entitlements exist, and he wanted that to be clear for everyone's purpose.

Commissioner Connell wanted to know what the width of the road would be to get back there. **Mr. Opsahl** stated the proposed asphalt road is 30 feet and that comes in off the boulevard entry. **PZD Miller** agreed the roads would have to be constructed to city standards, which is 30 feet. **Mr. Opsahl** said there would be 50 feet of right of way and at the mouth it would be 40 feet wide. **Commissioner Connell** said he was curious about the roadway going across the water. **Mr. Opsahl** responded that there is an existing canal that leads into Lake Harris, and it is open water. **Commissioner Connell** asked if they were planning to build a bridge over it. **Mr. Opsahl** agreed and said there would be a bridge installed to go over the open water. **Commissioner Connell** inquired if the bridge would be the same width? **Mr. Opsahl** replied that the bridge would be 30 feet.

Commissioner Pederson said he was hearing comments from the back but what he heard was that this would be the only entrance. It was the primary entrance. He also heard that the site work would all have to be done first. He wanted to make it clear that the roads would be built. **Mr. Opsahl** commented that the boulevard entrance would be the main access point, but there is also an exit on to Magnolia. **Mr. Collins** clarified that there would be a second access point to Magnolia. Referring to the slide, he said it was located at the bottom of the screen, and they could see that access to Magnolia, which is a county roadway. **Commissioner Pederson** wanted to know if they needed a second exit for this size of development. **Mr. Collins** said the canal does not go as far south, and it is shown on the rendering. They can see Magnolia near the bottom. **Commissioner Burry** questioned, if the canal goes all the way to the

lake, how are they going to have access to Magnolia? **Mr. Collins** pointed to the lower left side of the slide, which is all part of the upland portion of the parcel. **Commissioner Burry** thanked him for pointing that out because that would be after they came off the bridge. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other commission comments.

Commissioner Connell stated this was a terrible location for any type of development. He did not think we should put these two-story units in this area. He was sure most of it was sensitive, but with vegetation and everything else, it is just a bad location to put in any additional development. He heard several times that they could do this in the county, so how about this? Go to the county and do it in the county. The only reason they came to us was because the county would not let them do it. Let's be honest. That is why they came to us. If they can do it in the county, let them go to the county commission to get approval for it. He did not believe they should approve it. He knows the zoning and everything else, but they are coming to us for a reason and that is because the county will not let them do it, and we should not let them do it either. We should deny the annexation. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other commission comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Burry	No
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	No
Commissioner Connell	No
Mayor Reisman	No

One yea, four nays, the Commission denied the ordinance.

Mayor Reisman stated this ordinance failed, so the next two items on the agenda are now moot.

2. **An Ordinance amending the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Leesburg, changing the Future Land Use Map Designation of certain property containing 8.77 +/- acres from Lake County Urban Low to City of Leesburg Low Density Residential, for a property generally located east of US Highway 27 and north of Magnolia Avenue, lying in Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Venice at Lake Harris SSCP)**

**MOOT ORDINANCE 25-30
WAS NOT HEARD DUE TO ANNEXATION DENIAL**

3. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 8.77 +/- acres from Lake County C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) and R-6 (Urban Residential District) to City of Leesburg SPUD (Small Planned Unit Development) to allow for commercial and attached single family residential uses for a property generally located east of US Highway 27 and north of Magnolia Avenue, lying in Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Venice at Lake Harris SPUD)**

**MOOT ORDINANCE 25-31
WAS NOT HEARD DUE TO ANNEXATION DENIAL**

4. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 39.05 +/- acres; and being generally located north of East Dewey Robbins Road and south of Dewey Robbins Road, lying in Section 5, Township 21 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; providing that said property so annexed shall be liable for its proportionate share of the existing and future indebtedness of said city; providing that such annexed property shall be subject to all laws and ordinances of said city as if all such territory had been a part of the City of Leesburg at the time of passage and approval of said laws and ordinances; providing that such annexed territory shall be placed in City Commission District 3; and providing an effective date. (Bar Key II/Grace Groves ANNX)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-32

Commissioner Burry introduced ordinances 6.A.4, 6.A.5, and 6.A.6 to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinances by title only.

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated this was the BarKey II/Grace Groves property. It is a request for annexation, a small-scale comprehensive plan amendment, and a rezoning to the PUD. The property is thirty-nine plus or minus acres. It is generally located east of U.S. Highway 27 and south of Dewey Robbins Road. The project is surrounded by the existing BarKey Grace Groves project, and it is proposed to be part of that project. This parcel was not under contract at the time the first BarKey project was reviewed and approved by the city commission. This property would basically integrate into the overall BarKey project. The future land use would go from Lake County Rural to the City of Leesburg Estate. The zoning would go from Lake County Agricultural to City PUD. The request is for the future development of 156 single-family units. It does not add to the overall density of the existing BarKey project. It just simply becomes part of it. There would be 156 single-family detached units with a two-floor maximum height. It would be a platted subdivision. The individual units would be sold just like the rest of the BarKey development. There are no other uses permitted in the proposal. There are the standard design and architectural requirements that require a list of five features to choose from in the architectural features. Again 35% open space, which is exceeded. It includes dark sky lighting and significant buffering is provided for adjacent properties in the PUD and around areas that are not directly bounded by the BarKey development. They are adjacent to the existing BarKey, so they would become part of that development. They would not be required to have a buffer there. An open-style fence or a landscape berm is required along the eastern boundary of the site. Landscape buffers are not part of the lots. As always, we allow for Bahia or Bermuda grass instead of St Augustine. The standard sign requirements are no more than five feet in height at the entryway. We did receive a letter from Lake County requesting that we work with them about taking over some roadways in the area and city staff are working with Lake County in that regard. Our PUDs are written specifically to support any roadway upgrade requirements that Lake County has, so we will work with them on that. Finally, there is a phasing or

expiration clause which allows four years for substantial commencement, or the property would revert to the RE-1 zoning. Cindy Tarapani of Tarapani Planning Strategies is here to represent the case and answer any questions. The planning commission recommended approval of this project.

Commissioner Connell wanted to know the reason why these thirty-nine acres were not brought forward with the original submittal. **PZD Miller** answered that when the BarKey property was originally brought in, this property was not included because it was owned by a separate owner. **Commissioner Connell** said they are continuing to add property to this subdivision. **PZD Miller** replied yes. However, this piece of property is surrounded by the BarKey property. Currently, there is a hole in that PUD and for a long time there were ongoing negotiations for this property. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any further questions for the planning and zoning director. There were none.

Cindy Tarapani of Tarapani Planning Strategies said she was there to represent the applicant, Kolter Development. For the case today, they are calling it BarKey II as it is compared to the original BarKey I, which is the larger property. It was under completely separate ownership, and it was not under contract at the time that the original BarKey went through. It has subsequently been put under contract and that is why Kolter is here today. They would like to add it to the rest of the BarKey project.

Referring to the slides, she said she had Eric Morsee of Brookfield Kolter with her. He is the vice president. Also, Tom Daly is the landscape architect for the project. The civil engineer Brett Tobias and the traffic engineer Ayman Saidi. Biotech is the environmental consultant, but they were unable to be there. Brookfield Kolter has been around since 1997, over twenty-eight years. They are building communities in five different states. They have one hundred plus active projects, and they recently did a project that is similar in size, scope and complexity in the Lady Lake area. Kolter has the capability financially and the management to do projects of this complexity and size. As mentioned, the proposed site is the hole in the middle of the donut. The blue outline is the original BarKey that was approved in November 2022 and the yellow 40-acre outline is surrounded on three sides by BarKey. To the east is the Anthony property that was also approved for residential use. She showed the original concept plan for BarKey I. She also showed the master plan for BarKey II, which is the parcel we are talking about tonight. BarKey II will be accessed through the lighter yellow-colored parcel and then onto the loop road. This parcel is landlocked today, so BarKey is the most logical developer for it to be added to. It is only thirty-nine acres, and it has no road frontage at all. The maximum proposed development is 156 single-family detached units. Again, they will access through the existing Village 10 of BarKey. We can all remember the access road. The loop road for the project is a pretty major feature of the project. It has two major entrances, one on US 27 and the second one on the north side at Dewey Robbins Road. The loop road that was shown in the dark orange on the map shows how the project will be completely interconnected. Residents can go from one village to another without having to go on the local roads. They can also access the commercial shopping center which fronts US 27 without going on any local roads. They can access it through the loop road. Phase one of this project was approved by the city in March of this year. It includes 546 units and the main entrance will be on US 27 and the secondary entrance will be from Dewey Robbins Road. The community amenity center will be on the lake. All of that was part of the first phase of the project. This new BarKey II portion will be in phase two of the overall BarKey development. She showed how they have just slightly under one acre of wetlands. There are .8 acres of wetlands in the southern portion of the property. They are asking for a voluntary annexation into the City of Leesburg. The site is surrounded on four sides by city property, and on three sides of that is BarKey I. The fourth side is the Anthony property. We are also within the ISBA area for the City of Leesburg to annex. The plan amendment request is the same plan category that exists in BarKey I, the Hodges Reserve and the Anthony property. It is the same plan category that we have in this area. The rezoning for these projects is also in the city's PUD zoning district. However, of course, each one has their own master plan, but they are using the PUD district. The benefit of that for the city and the

public is that what you see is what you get. The only things that can be built within that project are shown in the master plan that was approved. If they approve the second portion as BarKey II, the same thing will apply. There will be no major changes made to this part or the larger original BarKey I unless it comes back through the public hearing process. Within the forty-five-foot lots in both BarKey II and BarKey I, we are adding additional parking at the end of each block to account for overflow parking, parties, holidays, or anything else like that which may require additional parking. There would be parallel parking spaces at the end caps of the blocks which are required by city code, and they are happy to present the architectural elevations. The residential units would be the same model types that are in BarKey I. There are four models to choose from. They have three two-story options and one one-story option. They range in size from fifteen hundred square feet to twenty-four hundred square feet, so they will be very compatible with the neighborhood and that area. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the developer. There were none. He opened public comments.

Michael Anne Hussan of 8601 East Dewey Robbins Road said the city has already approved 3,440 homes on Dewey Robbins Road. That road is only two miles long. If you go down South Dewey Robbins there are another 1,000 homes. Those homes go all the way down from East Dewey Robbins to US 27. How many cars do we have to put on the roads to make it totally inhumane to be there? People are selling their homes now because they do not want to live near this. If she wanted to live in The Villages, she would have bought in The Villages. They have destroyed the entire neighborhood and everything out there. There is no farmland left. She had just come from a Lake County Commission meeting. They know that farmland and agricultural land are being thrown at the wolves constantly. They are working hard against this, because they want to preserve agricultural land and they want people to be able to drive or bike down a road without being hit by a car. Also, this is the road that they use when the Turnpike is blocked. They have to divert traffic through this area. When that happens, she cannot get out of her own driveway. It is not just the housing, this is also an emergency road. These developments have made the whole neighborhood the worst. Do you think the people who voted for you really intended for you to make every square inch of Leesburg concrete? Nobody in the world would want that, so please stop. The City of Leesburg is developing, Howey in the Hills is developing, and so is Groveland. All three communities have access to these roads. It is really shameful. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any further public comments. There were none.

Ms. Tarrapani responded that all the roads within their development are at the obligation of the developer. Also, any improvements to Dewey Robbins Road that are required by the county are also the obligation of the developer. A separate developer is installing a light at Dewey Robbins Road and US 27. It was not their developer, it was a different developer on that road. If and when the project triggers a traffic signal at its main entrance at US 27, they would be obligated to put in the traffic signal at that point. They are regulated by FDOT and the county for Dewey Robbins Road along with the city. They feel with two major entrances to the project they will be able to handle all of that. Again they are not talking about BarKey I because that project was approved. They are only adding thirty-nine acres with a maximum of 156 lots to the BarKey project. They are asking for the last thirty-nine acres to be added. **Commissioner Connell** inquired about the number of lots currently in BarKey I. **Ms. Tarrapani** replied that seventeen hundred was the maximum number approved on seven hundred and seventeen acres. **Commissioner Connell** stated the city already has over 30,000 lots approved throughout the city. We already have 1,700 lots already approved for BarKey I. Do we really need to add another one hundred and fifty-six lots? He did not think we needed any more lots because we already had a slew of them. It will take the city thirty years to build out what we already have. We do not need to keep adding to an existing problem. We need to consider this and not move forward because they already have seventeen hundred lots to build. We do not need to add another one hundred and fifty lots to it. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any commission comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission adopted the ordinance.

- 5. An Ordinance amending the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Leesburg, changing the Future Land Use Map Designation of certain property containing 39.05 +/- acres from Lake County Rural to City of Leesburg Estate Residential, for a property generally located north of East Dewey Robbins Road and south of Dewey Robbins Road, lying in Section 5, Township 21 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Bar Key II SSCP)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-33

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission adopted the ordinance.

- 6. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 39.05 +/- acres from Lake County A (Agriculture) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow for residential for a property generally located north of East Dewey Robbins Road and south of Dewey Robbins Road, lying in Section 5, Township 21 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Bar Key II PUD)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-34

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission adopted the ordinance.

Mayor Reisman mentioned that paragraph 3E of the 2014 ISBA agreement between Lake County and the City ensures that all current and future roads are brought up under the city dedication. He wanted to know if we could do a study to see which roads needed to fall under that. **CM Minner** said the agreement stipulates that if the city accumulates a certain percentage of land along roadways, then that roadway becomes the city's, with some maintenance requirements. That paragraph is a little tricky for two reasons. First, how do we calculate 50% of the linear roadway, because the paragraph stipulates collector roads. We will need to have some discussion about what the definition of a collector road is going to be. For example, is Dewey Robbins a collector road? Also, would it be 50% of the linear frontage coming from collector roads, which are US 27 and SR 19, and is any intersection along US 27 considered a collector road? Secondly, the last sentence of that paragraph has a "however clause," which kind of unwraps the maintenance requirements. He emailed the county to talk about some JPA issues, roads being a primary one, so we will have some initial discussions with the county on how we go about firming up our portions of the ISBA agreement. However, as far as this adoption, he did not think what we added complicates the issue any more than it already is.

7. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 0.81 +/- acres; and being generally located west of Richey Road and south of W Main Street, lying in Section 28, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; providing that said property so annexed shall be liable for its proportionate share of the existing and future indebtedness of said city; providing that such annexed property shall be subject to all laws and ordinances of said city as if all such territory had been a part of the City of Leesburg at the time of passage and approval of said laws and ordinances; providing that such annexed territory shall be placed in City Commission District 2; and providing an effective date. (Richey Road Storage ANNX)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-35

Commissioner Burry introduced ordinances 6.A.7, 6.A.8, 6.A.9, and 6.A.10 to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinances by title only.

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated this site as indicated is eighty-one plus or minus undeveloped acres. The undeveloped acres are on the backside. The request has four separate parts. First, an annexation, a small-scale comprehensive plan amendment, a rezoning which is standard, and then we have a planned development overlay (PDO). Under the future land use it would go from Lake County Urban Medium to City of Leesburg General Commercial. The zoning would go from Lake County R-6, which is Urban Residential,

to City of Leesburg C-3 General Commercial. Under this, there is a very simple PDO that would allow for the standard C-3 General Commercial uses. The main property at 301 Richey Road has an existing building and the property under consideration has a fence running along the east side and the south side. The PDO requires them to have a fence along the entire perimeter of the property since they would like to have RV storage. There is nothing on that property now, but they would like to add RV and boat storage. This is a very straight rezoning. Other than that, it is the standard C-3 zoning like the rest of the property in the area. The sundown provision is not applicable because it goes to a straight zoning. We did not have to put much into this proposed use because it is consistent with the zoning standards and the comprehensive plan. We received no comments from Lake County Public Works, and we received approval from the neighbor as long as there was a fence. It really is just annexing this piece of land and zoning it C-3 like the rest of the property.

Commissioner Burry thought he saw that one of the neighbors wanted a higher fence. **PZD Miller** said yes, he wanted a higher fence. So, what staff did was put in the PUD that it could be from six to eight feet. It could be anywhere from six to eight feet. If the commission wants to require that the fence be eight feet, they can do that. **Mayor Reisman** wanted to know if the eight-foot fence would only be on the Richey Road portion? **PZD Miller** replied the eight-foot fence requirement can be wherever they want. **Mayor Reisman** stated they already have a fence on the back side. **PZD Miller** responded that there is a fence currently on the south and the west sides, but they can make that requirement if they would like. **Commissioner Burry** stated he would like to have that fence be eight feet, especially with the height of RVs. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if tractor trailers would be included. **PZD Miller** replied that any kind of outdoor storage would be possible. **Commissioner Berry** then asked if anyone would be allowed to utilize this property? **PZD Miller** answered it would be open to the public as long as they paid the monthly fee. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to confirm that this would be protected and secured for security reasons. **PZD Miller** said the fence would be the security. He was not sure if the applicant planned to add any further security measures. However, the fence would be there as a security measure. **Commissioner Berry** inquired if there would be a possibility of jobs for people. **PZD Miller** responded that he would hesitate to say yes to that because it is just a fenced area. If they wanted to hire a security person, they did have that option, but he was not sure if it would be needed since this is just a small space. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there was anything in the language for when they have RVs or semis there that says no maintenance can be done on site. **PZD Miller** said they could add no maintenance. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know how long these vehicles would be allowed to sit. She was referring to the RVs. **Commissioner Burry** said that would be handled through their contract. **Commissioner Berry** said she was specifically referring to the storage. If someone was pulling a boat. They may pull their boat in and out during the summer every weekend, then store it during the wintertime. Is there a term of six or eight months? **PZD Miller** explained that would be covered in the contract. **Commissioner Burry** said it would be handled just like a storage facility even though it is just a parking lot. **CA Watson** added that there are some differences in terms of how long a person might rent that space. If it is six months or less, they would be considered a transient renter, so it is a little easier for the landowner to deal with the removal of those types of folks. More rights come the longer you are there and if you hit that six-month threshold, then you have some stronger protection. It could vary depending on whatever the owner wants to do with their site. Someone may have an RV that is easily movable and someone may be storing something that makes it a little more difficult. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if this could be done with any private property in a commercial zoned area. She was now referring to food trucks. **PZD Miller** said in terms of food trucks there is an item on the agenda tonight and the potential answer to that is yes. However, it depends on the individual site. However, that could be possible. **Commissioner Pederson** mentioned that he thought this was a permitted use under C-3. **PZD Miller** added that he thought so too, until he found out it was not. **Mayor Reisman** wanted to know if there was anything they could add that says it cannot be an immobilized vehicle and that the vehicle has to be running? He knew there were trailers, but he did not want this to turn into a junkyard. **PZD Miller**

pointed out that they could call out that they cannot store junked vehicles. However, he believed that is called out in the C-3, but they could add that the vehicles and trailers must be licensed and registered. **Commissioner Connell** stated he did not have any problems with the annexation and rezoning, but he did have concerns with the outdoor storage. Lord knows we already have enough junk cars that we see when driving down the roads. We do not need to keep adding to this problem. **Commissioner Pederson** remarked that this would be set well off the road in a heavy commercial/light industrial area. It is a pretty good fit. **Commissioner Connell** said he understands that this would not be on the main drag, but he still does not want to continue adding to something we already have a problem with. Anything that is stored out there needs to be very limited, and we need to have a real scope of what is allowed. He agreed with Commissioner Berry about tractor trailers because he did not see them working. If we are going to limit this to boats and RVs, then it needs to state boats and RVs and anything that is there needs to be properly registered and tagged because it is not a junkyard. He had no problems with the zoning and annexation, but he was not sure if we needed more outdoor storage. However, if we are going to do it, then there needs to be some major restrictions on it. **Commissioner Pederson** disagreed. We are grossly overly complicating an outdoor storage area for the applicant. **Commissioner Connell** asked if he had seen some of the other outdoor storage areas around town. **Commissioner Pederson** explained that he would not approve this if it were on a major thoroughfare. This is a good location for this type of product. He was just trying to be respectful to the applicant. **Commissioner Connell** stated he was not trying to be disrespectful. He was not saying it was a bad fit, but there needs to be some high restrictions on it if we are going to allow more outdoor storage in this town. **Commissioner Berry** added that she would not want to see this on a major thoroughfare. However, she would agree with this area, but she was concerned about what was already in residential yards that could be moved to this area to be parked. When riding through neighborhoods that do not have an HOA, you see boats, RVs, and now they could potentially see food trucks parked in yards. We need to have stronger restrictions put in place that include the length of time, the in and out and security. **Commissioner Pederson** respectfully disagreed because we are about to talk about an ordinance that addresses food trucks. They would have to basically move their truck every night, and we cannot block storage areas in town. **Commissioner Berry** said we do not allow that type of storage at their residential homes, so where would they go? **Commissioner Pederson** stated they would have to store it at this place if we approve it. This would be a perfect fit, that is what it would be for. Again, we are overly complicating it. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to clarify that he would want to put high restrictions on this. **Commissioner Pederson** said in this area he does not see that. It is only .81 acres, so he can only store so much. We would not be approving a junkyard because that is under a different zoning category. **Commissioner Connell** remarked that if they are not tagged and registered it is probably junk. **Commissioner Pederson** stated he did not want to argue all these points, because we are overly complicating this. No one wants a junkyard. Plus, he did not believe storing tractor trailers was the applicant's intent. **Mayor Reisman** added that the property would not be big enough for that, so they could put a restriction on that. **Commissioner Berry** said it stated RVs and boats. However, there is a problem with tractor trailers being parked on the sides of roads in residential areas. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that if they lived in unincorporated county then they would be allowed to park in their yards. If it is happening in the city, it is prohibited. **Mayor Reisman** said if they are doing that in the city, that would be a code violation. **Commissioner Berry** said exactly, but not only are they on the side of the roads, they are also parked back against the sides of their homes and that was her concern. She did not disagree with the zoning. She was supportive, she listened, and she heard what was being said, but she was concerned if there would be more of this. We would have to acquire an area to store things if we have something coming down the pipe that will require food trucks to move because they cannot go to their homes. The trailers that haul yard waste and landscaping industries cannot park their trucks on the side of somebody else's property or on the side of their yards. **PZD Miller** said this would be an ideal location for a landscaper to park. The owner and applicant were present if the commission wanted to hear from him. **Commissioner Connell** questioned if they could limit what could be stored there as long as it was reasonable. **Commissioner Pederson** said as long as it was reasonable.

However, they should talk to the applicant because he did not believe that was the intent. **Commissioner Connell** said he did not want to see more airplane parts.

Chris Kelly of 4525 Myrtle Street, Edgewater stated this was an evolution overlay. Initially, they did not have a storage facility in mind, and they still do not. Their first preference for this property was to put up a warehouse that meets all the setbacks that could include some outdoor storage. There are some types of businesses, such as plumbing, that need some outside storage for things like PVC pipe. Having an area outside to have a layout space and having the ability to do that makes it more marketable. What the planning and zoning director was trying to do was to not have us come back with something that did not meet the requirements under the zoning that they have. This has evolved into something that it was never intended to be. Their first preference is not to store boats, RVs, junk or any of that stuff. Their preference is to have a warehouse. They have already talked to a local engineer who has done several projects in the city. They will make a conceptual plan because this property is not part of the stormwater retention system that is in place with some of the other properties around it. We will have to come back so they can store water to do a development, but it will be small. They were trying to not have to come back before the commission for a second time. He was sensitive to the comments that were made about what had happened on Main Street because he had also seen it. They do not want to be a part of that either. Their intention is to have a very nice clean warehouse with some outside storage and if that requires an eight-foot fence, that is fine. There is already a nice white vinyl fence on two sides, and they keep that whole area mowed. They are doing their best to be good neighbors. They already own the warehouse that is immediately adjacent to it to the north, and they are looking at developmental options while keeping the door open to do something that will be beneficial for that property and the city. They are open to suggestions, but he certainly has no issues with junk, cars and boats that are not registered. They would not entertain doing anything like that and, to be blunt, they did not want to get into that business. As Commissioner Connell said, if it gets approved it rides with the land, and he was absolutely correct.

Mayor Reisman said gauging the commission do they want an eight-foot fence restriction, along with a restriction for only storing registered and entitled vehicles? Would they want to put a restriction saying no semis? **Commissioner Berry** said this was a great idea, and it is much-needed in the city, but she had questions about how they would get in and out. Would they just drive freely or would there be an automatic gate? **Mr. Kelly** explained that he was not interested in that type of product at all. Their preference was to put up a warehouse. However, in some cases, some types of businesses do require some outside storage. For example, in Sanford there is a sprinkler supply business. They have a warehouse, and they also store some items outside on rafters and racks. It would be that type of outside storage. They do now want to get into storing RVs or boats. Also, in some cases, businesses may do land development so they may have equipment like skid steers that need to be stored somewhere outside. They do need a place to put that type of stuff so it could be considered outside storage. The outside storage would be in conjunction with a warehouse concept. They do not anticipate going into the storage business with it being self-storage of boats or RVs. The planning department staff brought this to their attention because it was not part of that zoning wording. Again, to be sensitive to Commissioner Connell, once it is voted on, it is voted on. If they sold the land, then those entitlements would run with the land. He was sensitive to what the city wanted to see in the long run.

Commissioner Berry wanted to confirm that his intentions were to have a warehouse. **Mr. Kelly** replied yes, that was his objective. **Mayor Reisman** said that would be his final objective, but they are still working on it. So, right now, they would like to do storage, but their ultimate objective is to build a warehouse down the road. Right now, they would like to use it for storage, so they need to take the warehouse out of the picture and focus on the storage. He asked if someone wanted to make a motion. **Commissioner Connell** said he wanted clarification because the applicant referenced storing PVC piping and everything else. So, now we are moving completely away from vehicles. So what is it? If this were to

pass, he would want a list of what is permissible to be stored there. If it is going to be open-ended storage where they can put whatever they want, then he would be an absolute no. **PZD Miller** mentioned that he did not explain it correctly to begin with. He would like to come in and use the C-3 uses, which is basically expanding the existing warehouse or adding another warehouse. The PDO is simply to add an option for outdoor storage if it is necessary once the project is annexed. For example, plumbers do sprinkler systems, so they will need that storage area to lay out pipes. They will need large amounts of storage. When they have outdoor storage, they can easily get into vehicles. However, that was not the primary consideration. The primary consideration was to have a warehouse, but the PDO is to simply say if outdoor storage is needed, then they can use it for outdoor storage. However, if they use outdoor storage, we have to take into account that people may want to rent a space for an RV, an old car or whatever. So, if the commission wishes to restrict that to say no semis, that would be fine, but it would be a great place for food trucks. **Commissioner Connell** asked if they could do the annexation and rezoning tonight without passing the PDO until they receive a full list of what would be allowed underneath the PDO. **PZD Miller** answered yes. If the commission allows them to hold it off, that can be done. **CA Watson** said this was an overlay, so it would be okay to table that item to a certain date and location. **PZD Miller** stated they could bring back a list to the meeting. **Mr. Kelly** wanted to provide a little history of this property. When they purchased the warehouse, they also purchased about fifty feet behind the existing warehouse. Since then, they added another fifty feet because they purchased it from the owner to the south. Now that .81 acres is still in the county, and the tenants who are currently leasing that warehouse are using that big grass field to park trailers and trucks. So, currently they are parking on county property. They are using it to park a couple of vehicles. When they acquired the extra fifty feet, they realized they needed to bring it into the city and change the zoning so they would meet what the city's expectations were. That was how this all began. They do not have a concrete business plan for this property yet. It may stay a grass field for quite some time, but at least the two or three cars that are there, or if they have a tenant that has a trailer that they need to park behind the warehouse it is there. They will put the fence up, and they will be in compliance with the city. **Commissioner Berry** asked that when this comes back can they have a business plan of what they are looking to do with this property. **PZD Miller** said there would be temporary storage adjacent to the primary warehouse. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other commission comments or public comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the ordinance.

8. **An Ordinance amending the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Leesburg, changing the Future Land Use Map Designation of certain property containing 0.81 +/- acres from Lake County Urban Medium to City of Leesburg General Commercial, for a property generally located west of Richey Road and South of W Main Street, lying in Section 28, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Richey Road Storage SSCP)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-36

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the ordinance.

- 9. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 0.81 +/- acres from Lake County R-6 (Urban Residential) to City of Leesburg C-3 (Highway Commercial) to allow for commercial uses for a property generally located west of Richey Road and South of W Main Street, lying in Section 28, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Richey Road RZ)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-37

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the ordinance.

- 10. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, adding a PDO (Planned Development Overlay) to the C-3 (Highway Commercial) Zoning on approximately 0.81 +/- acres to allow for outdoor storage uses for a property generally located west of Richey Road and South of W Main Street, lying in Section 28, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Richey Road PDO)**

TABLED ORDINANCE

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

Commissioner Berry made a motion to table this item until the July 14th city commission meeting to allow for further information to be provided and considered before voting, and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission tabled the ordinance.

11. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida amending the City's Code of Ordinances; Chapter 25, Section 25-292 (18) Mobile food vending; providing for conflicts, severability, and an effective date. (Mobile Food Vendor Ordinance Revision)

TABLED ORDINANCE

Commissioner Pederson introduced the ordinance to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinance by title only.

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller said, as noted at the June 9th city commission meeting, there has been a significant increase in the number of food trucks in the city over the past few years. Under the city's current ordinance, technically they are required to get a permit and meet specific standards listed on the permit. The Florida legislature preempted permitting of food trucks under Section 509.102 of the Florida Statute, which states that we cannot require licenses, registrations, permits and fees. This is the case with food trucks, tree permits, group homes, business tax receipts, and other functions of local government when the state legislature chooses to control them. Now, because of that preemption, staff have now been charged with updating the local codes to meet the state requirements. In the proposed ordinance, there will be three options to allow for mobile food vendors; one is to require a letter of location compliance, which we are allowed to do under the state statute. It would not be a permit; the letter of location compliance just says this location in particular meets the requirements of the ordinance in the statute. Secondly, we would allow them two times per year under a temporary use permit. That is if someone comes in and says they want to try a certain spot to see if it would work for them. Then, they could come back for a letter of location compliance if that spot worked out. Finally, we would allow mobile food vendors in conjunction with special events such as Bikefest or the Arts Festival, those types of events. At the June 9th meeting, Senior Planner Max VanAllen gave a presentation about the proposed changes to the mobile food vending ordinance and answered some questions from the commission. She was present tonight to go over the revisions of that ordinance.

Senior Planner (SP), Max VanAllen, said the first section that was amended was Section I, Location Requirements. They added no active unresolved code enforcement cases as a requirement for an eligible location. We also added no mobile food trucks within a 200-foot buffer of any brick-and-mortar

restaurant unless expressed written consent was provided. This secondary location requirement was based on the following research. They conducted some research and looked at 500-foot, 200-foot and 100-foot radiuses. Referring to the slide, she said they looked at a particular location and measured from the food truck to the property line. In this case, for this study, the 500-foot buffer is quite large. They had four conflict areas that showed up as brick-and-mortar restaurants. The yellow dot in the center is the mobile food vendor and the larger yellow circle (the buffer) crosses North 14th Street and beyond. So, the research shows that the 500-foot buffer they are dealing with was a very large radius with the potential for many conflicts, especially when it comes to smaller parcels with single mobile food vendors. The 200-foot buffer has a medium radius. In this case, they found two restaurant conflicts, and it still crossed North 14th Street, so they are still picking up a good area. There was not too much radius, however, it did pick up extraneous conflicts. This would be the planning and zoning recommendation based on research. The research involved plotting the current mobile food vendor permits on a map and then running the buffer to create the circle radius. This was just one example, but they did it for every permit going back to 2023. The 100-foot buffer is small and in this case they did find one restaurant conflict at this location, but it did not sufficiently cross across the street as the other buffers have. This is highly dependent on where the mobile food vendor is parked on the property. If we were measuring from food truck to restaurant property line, that was their major concern with the 100-foot buffer. Moving to Section K, Operational Standards, they clarified that special event permits would allow overnight parking in the case of weekend-long special events such as Bikefest. They also added that all state licenses must be clearly displayed for customers in the window of the mobile food dispensing vehicle during operational hours. The next section, Section L, Grounds for Revocation. They clarified that the police department would be the backup enforcement agency outside the city code enforcement's normal operating hours. They also added no unresolved code enforcement cases for mobile food vendor vehicles or the principal business. This was another area where they were clarifying that. **PZD Miller** said they added those changes as a result of the conversations from the last meeting. These were all specifically taken from what the commission asked for.

Continuing, **SP VanAllen** said at the last meeting they discussed a food truck alley. City staff went ahead and identified three sites; one publicly owned and two privately owned as potential options. The first being a portion of the Resource Center property. They highlighted that area in green. That is city-owned property, and they would need to work out some sort of mechanism for food truck leases. They felt this was an appropriate area because there was a lack of restaurant options in the surrounding area. This would fill that need at this particular site. Another option, which is privately owned, would be a portion of the Lake Square Mall. They have had interest from both the mall and the planning commission to allow for multiple food trucks at this site. We feel this may be an appropriate location for multiple vendors. Of course, we would have to work with the property owner to draw up some sort of agreement and perhaps that would require a planned development overlay to get that site to work. They did a ride around the city to map out possible locations for mobile food vendors and what we discovered was a vacant property across from Yellow Jacket Way, which is currently privately-owned. It is right off US 27, so it would be located right off a major thoroughfare. Of course, they would have to work with the property owner, but at this time it is vacant property that could be developed. **Mayor Reisman** asked for comments and questions.

Commissioner Connell said it was mentioned that staff were proposing a 200-foot radius. Is that a 200-foot radius from the location of the food truck? **SP VanAllen** replied it would be from the location of the food truck to the property line of the property with a restaurant. They are open to amending that based on commission wishes. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to be clear. Would the location of the food truck be to the actual brick-and-mortar building or is it to the property line that the brick-and-mortar building sits on? **SP VanAllen** replied it would be the property line that the brick-and-mortar building sits on. **Commissioner Connell** then questioned if they were measuring from where the food truck parked. How

would they know it was parked in the exact same location every day? **SP VanAllen** replied that would be something they could look at. **Commissioner Connell** pointed out that it should be 200-feet away from the property line that the food truck sits on, and it should go to the property line that the brick-and-mortar building sits on. For him, going from the food truck they are mobile, so they may not always park in exactly the same spot. Referring to Palm Plaza, they could be 200-feet across the parking lot one day, but the next day they could park closer even though they are still in the parking lot. He wanted to make sure that if they moved along with this, it did not become a problem for staff when trying to keep track of where these food trucks or carts are parked every single day. **SP VanAllen** indicated that there are two ways one could address this. One would be to go from property line to property line and the other would be to add a site plan as part of the letter of location compliance that would show exactly where they would be parking. Again, that would be part of their location compliance. They could add that to the language, saying a site plan would be needed to be compliant. That is definitely something staff could investigate, or they could switch from property line to property line for that measurement.

Commissioner Pederson said during the last meeting they discussed the 100, 200, and 500-foot radius, and it was just alluded to. Referring to the example, that food truck would now be out of business unless he moves his truck on the property. However, we would put this guy out of business period. At 200 feet, what is the percentage or how many food trucks would we impact? **SP VanAllen** replied that based on the mapping, it would be roughly half of them. **Commissioner Pederson** wanted to know roughly how many food trucks we have in the city currently. **PZD Miller** responded that there are close to twenty trucks right now. There are quite a number, but if the food trucks were within that buffer, they would have to get the permission of the property owner, saying that they did not mind them being there. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to verify that there would be one food truck per property. **SP VanAllen** agreed. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if the trucks would rotate. If another truck wants to come another month or is that one forever? **SP VanAllen** explained that there would be one per property until written revocation is provided. It would have to say that this vendor is no longer here, then the new vendor could apply for that location, but we do need it in writing. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know what the timeframe would be for that. **SP VanAllen** replied one year. **Mayor Reisman** questioned if that would be based on the principal business for how long they would want them to be there? **Commissioner Berry** mentioned that a vendor could decide after two days that they would not be successful with revenue at that location, so they may not want to stay there. Would they have to wait one year before they can go anywhere else? **SP VanAllen** indicated that the one year is the letter of compliance and that is done on a permanent basis. They would have to re-up every year by coming in and providing their letter of location compliance. In addition, if they wanted to leave and go somewhere else, they would provide that written paperwork to the city. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to confirm that they would have that option. **SP VanAllen** replied they have an option where they could say this site did not work, and they can revoke and move to a new site where there are no other food trucks. **Mayor Reisman** said if they tried option two, that is two days, two times a year, they could test the site to see if it is revenue-generating and, if it is, they could apply for a letter of compliance, which gives them a year. **Commissioner Burry** inquired if the State of Florida requires a 200-foot radius? Also, do they require that a food truck leaves every night? **SP VanAllen** answered no. **Commissioner Burry** continued to say that we would be the ones putting restrictions on folks that are operating businesses. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that we would be putting half of them out of business. **Commissioner Burry** felt it would be more than just half. He wanted everyone to be aware of what they were doing. At this point, he was not in favor of this. **Commissioner Berry** said we would not only put people out of business, we would be using residential areas to park food trucks at night. It is happening now, and it does not look good. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that they should not be doing that. If they are city residents, they should contact code enforcement.

Commissioner Berry said they were there trying to come up with a plan, but at that point there was no

plan. No offense, but this needs to be thought through more because, otherwise, we are telling the food trucks that they cannot sit at the auto station overnight. So where would they move the trucks too? Where would they go? If they have nowhere to go, they are going to take that food truck home. If they live in a residential area within the city, that is not allowed. **Mayor Reisman** pointed out that they could take the trucks to a storage facility like U-Haul or something like that. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know who would go there every day to verify the trucks are in the same spot. They may not know. We need to give a plan and a timeframe. **Mayor Reisman** indicated that there are a lot of businesses that store their business property in a storage facility. They would go there every day to get it and drop it back off. They would have to drive back and forth every day. **Commissioner Berry** said that was her point. She was trying to figure out what the plan would be for providing a storage area for someone to go to. She knows the city is not into the storage business, but we have to consider this when we say no. **Commissioner Pederson** stated they just tried to approve a storage yard, but that got very complicated. **Commissioner Berry** felt it was not complicated, and it was not clear about what was being presented. Then, as we saw, he did not have a plan. However, we are talking about food trucks, and she wants to be clear about how we can be fair to people when food trucks are their income. We do not need to see food trucks parked right on the streets, nor do we need them parked right next to or in front of restaurants or businesses that we want people to patronize. However, they have to remember some of the five-star restaurants started on a corner in major cities. She would like this to be as fair and equitable as possible across the board. She does not want to make any hasty decisions because this has not been really thought through. **Commissioner Connell** stated two weeks ago he brought this issue up with food trucks. He wants to make sure that these food trucks do not harm our brick-and-mortar restaurants, and the proposal of a 200-foot distance is fair. If established businesses do not have an issue with it, they can release it and the 200-feet goes away. That is only fair to our business owners. If they do not think it affects their business with the food truck sitting basically in the parking lot, then surely sign the waiver and let them sit there. He would be fine with that. He just wanted to give our business owners some protection. **Commissioner Berry** and **Mayor Reisman** agreed with that statement. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any public comments.

Gary Custer of 8909 East Treasure Island Avenue, Leesburg, said he lives in the county, so this really does not affect him. However, he does have a food truck on his property. He rents spaces to park big trucks and boats. This ordinance would affect those businesses. They are a business and these people provide jobs too. In some cases, these food trucks have four different people that work for them. They are making money for the family to live on. **Commissioner Connell** said he understood, but there is a difference between a food truck and a brick-and-mortar established restaurant. **Mr. Custer** commented that the city has already eliminated having tables and chairs in front of the food trucks. That was in the old ordinance. They took a four-page ordinance and made it eight pages. There is a brick-and-mortar restaurant with air conditioning, wait staff, and if somebody wants to go to a food truck to get food, they are going to go to a food truck because they do not want to go inside a restaurant and sit down. These are the people that mow your grass, paint your house, or install your roof. They want to eat food quickly and easily. **Commissioner Connell** reaffirmed that the city was not eliminating them. We are only limiting the location. If the restaurant does not feel the food truck is affecting them, then they can sign off and allow them to stay. **Mr. Custer** remarked that if a brick-and-mortar restaurant cannot compete with a food truck with wait staff and air-conditioning, then they need to step their game up. **Commissioner Connell** respectfully disagreed. **Mr. Custer** said he could not believe the city would want to put these people out of business. Most of the owners of food trucks are minorities, so if you put them out of business, what are they going to do? Where are they going to go? The city wants to put them in a food alley or in the mall. Not everybody has access to the mall.

Colin Robles, owner of the super taco truck on US 441, said there has to be some special provisions. He is also the owner of the plaza where his food truck is located. He is not renting a space because his truck

is parked and registered through the same corporation. He would have to move his truck from this location to another one. He has five families that are supported by this food truck. He does not believe any restaurant would allow it or give him a letter saying it is okay to do it. That is ridiculous. If they put that clause in, nobody is going to accept that. **Commissioner Pederson** wanted to verify that he owned the property and if this ordinance included the 200-foot rule, would that put you out of business? **Mr. Robles** answered yes. **Commissioner Pederson** stated he was sympathetic to that. **Mayor Reisman** said he knew where his business was, but wanted to know which restaurant it would have a conflict with. **Mr. Robles** said it would be El Ranchito and the new breakfast place. He had already heard some complaints about his food truck from the new restaurant. No one is going to say yes or give him a letter. **Mayor Reisman** remarked that if you are a property owner, you are authorized to put it on your property. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that the ordinance also states that they are required to move it every night. **Mayor Reisman** agreed. However, without picking on him, he is also storing two food trucks, an RV, and a boat at this location. **Mr. Robles** agreed, and said right now it is also under construction. **Mayor Reisman** stated it has been like this for a couple of years. **Mr. Robles** indicated that those would be gone. **Mayor Reisman** indicated that when he talked to him months ago about this he brought it to his attention. **Mr. Robles** said yes, he had been working on putting a new roof on the building. **Mayor Reisman** wanted to know if it was the buffer that was catching everybody. **Commissioner Pederson** mentioned that he had already chimed in when Commissioner Connell brought it up. He believes the intent is good, and he fully understands the intent, but when they get into the weeds here, he does not like that they are putting people out of business. He is troubled by that, and he would like to slow this down and let the staff work on it a bit more. He does not have the answers tonight, because this is a tough one. He could not support a resolution that puts ten out of twenty food vendors out of business. Granted, they can move, but it still troubles him. Also, Commissioner Burry brought up a good point too, because the state also has regulations on this. It is a complicated issue, so he would like to slow it down. However, he does not know if we are even going to accomplish anything. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there was a way for staff to tell them how many of these food trucks are at locations that have code violations? **Commissioner Pederson** said that would be a whole different issue. **PZD Miller** replied that they could do more research on that. It may be a good idea to slow it down because there are some trucks out there that are not permitted. **Commissioner Pederson** continued to say they would be the ones that are not properly licensed and the ones that have code enforcement issues. We do need to toughen up on those, but for the hardworking gentleman, he does not feel good about it. Also, this gentleman owns his own property, so that compounds it even more.

Commissioner Berry wanted to know more about the recommendation of having food truck areas around town. Can staff look to see if there are possible locations and if the locations would be financially feasible? Is there an area around town that is nowhere near a brick-and-mortar that could be used as a food truck area to address the workers that need to eat quickly? **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that they would have to approve a zoning overlay to allow that on any property. **PZD Miller** agreed. He does like the idea of slowing it down to allow staff more time to go back and do additional research. Staff would appreciate the additional time to do some more research and to get some individual feedback. He believes they will come up with more clarifications. **Commissioner Pederson** agreed this was a tough assignment, but putting people out of business bothers him. **PZD Miller** commented that he believes they can come up with a plan to satisfy everyone's concerns. They can put in a buffer, which is what Commissioner Connell wants. They can look for different places which then become a separate issue from just this ordinance, but they can figure out if they will need to be taken out overnight. However, we need some feedback, and they can make some changes to make it better. **Commissioner Pederson** indicated that there were some good things here, but the moving every day bothered him. That would be very burdensome. **Mayor Reisman** wanted to know if he would be okay with the long-term if they had a letter of compliance. **Commissioner Pederson** replied that, based on what he heard, we also do not allow them to put up tables or chairs. He had not seen one food truck that really bothered him. He understands

how this started with food trucks competing with restaurants. However, he is open-minded. **Mayor Reisman** added that some food truck vendors were putting tents up and drilling into the ground. Some were even dumping oil on the ground, so that is where a lot of this came from. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that the city should be tougher on those types of issues. We need to focus on the ones who are not licensed and the ones who have code enforcement issues. We should focus on them in the short term while we sort this out. **PZD Miller** said if they could give them thirty to forty-five days that would be a big help. They could come back with some revisions to address some of the additional feedback from the individual commissioners about what they would like to see. He believes they can make something work. **Commissioner Berry** asked if they said no private property or can a private property host an area for this? **PZD Miller** answered yes. Private property can do that. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that it would still require a zoning overlay. **PZD Miller** agreed. It would require a zoning overlay, but if it was a C-3 and there was good access and parking, they could make that work. On private property, the owner will want to charge each truck and that is contractual with the private sector, and we do not have to worry about that. However, we do need to worry about access and having enough parking, those kinds of things. If the city owns the property and does not have a plan for it, then we need to reach out to the city manager to see if that would be something that works, because there are food deserts out there where it is difficult, especially if you do not have car access or transportation. These are things that they need to pay attention to. The idea of the property by the Resource Center staff really liked that one because that area is a food desert area. There are some things that we could add and make some revisions on.

Commissioner Burry made a motion to table this item for the August 25, 2025, city commission meeting and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Commissioner Burry added that in the meantime, staff should speak with individuals because we all have different ideas, and we need to work them out. **PZD Miller** said he would appreciate that. **Commissioner Pederson** mentioned that the owners of the food trucks should also contact planning and zoning because we want their input too. He then informed the commission that he would not be able to attend the city commission meeting of August 25th.

Commissioner Burry amended his motion to change the date to the August 11, 2025, city commission meeting and Commissioner Berry seconded that motion.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission tabled the ordinance.

Mayor Reisman apologized because he missed allowing someone to speak during public comments. He asked the gentleman if he still wished to speak.

A gentleman named Jose said he owned the food truck that is located in the Tractor Supply plaza across the street from Rural King. The food truck is near the La Palma Mexican Grill. They sell chicken and ribs on the grill. They started at the flea market with a dream of doing it. They have rainy days, cold days, and hot days. They went on vacation, and they told them they could not do it anymore at the flea market. They decided to buy a new food truck for \$45,000. They started their dream in Leesburg. When they moved here, they lost all the customers because they were in Marion County. When they moved to

Leesburg, they had to start over with zero clients and zero money for a couple of weeks. They put out tables and tents. They made it back, and then they were told they had to remove the tables and the tents. The city cut the hands off of all of them. They were almost one step towards opening a business with a food truck and a builder. He spoke with city staff a couple of months ago about that. However, as soon as they had to take the tables out, they lost a lot of clients. They had all the permits. They were legal. They had everything they needed to sell on the street, and then they were sent a letter that said they had to remove the trucks every single night. That is hard because his wife works in food trucks, and he works in lawn care. He is the only person that can drive heavy trucks, so it will be difficult for them to start over. They cannot compete with a restaurant, and they cannot compete with other food trucks. We feed the workers on the street. We feed the laborers on the street. They do not want to go inside the restaurant and pay \$65 in thirty minutes. On a food truck they pay \$10 to \$15. They even support the people that work for the city and the county. They give them free drinks because they work for the city or county. **Mayor Reisman** thanked him for his comments.

B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES:

- 1. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 91.07 +/- acres; and being generally located south of CR 48 and east of Number Two Road, lying in Sections 17 & 20, Township 20 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; providing that said property so annexed shall be liable for its proportionate share of the existing and future indebtedness of said city; providing that such annexed property shall be subject to all laws and ordinances of said city as if all such territory had been a part of the City of Leesburg at the time of passage and approval of said laws and ordinances; providing that such annexed territory shall be placed in City Commission District 3; and providing an effective date. (Lake Margaretta ANNEX)**

Commissioner Burry introduced ordinances 6.B.1, 6.B.2, and 6.B.3 to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinances by title only.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated this was the Lake Margaretta Escapes project. It consists of one hundred and ninety-six acres. It is located south of CR 48 and east of Number Two Road. The request is for annexation, large-scale comprehensive plan amendment, and rezoning. Approximately one hundred and three of the one hundred and ninety-six acres are already in the city limits. So, part of this project has to be annexed, and then the entire one hundred and ninety-six acres would need to be rezoned. It currently has city zoning districts of Agricultural and Estate Density Residential and the future land use of Estate. That is the property that is currently in the city. The comprehensive plan for this property is for the remaining ninety acres and the rezoning is for the entire one hundred and ninety-six acres. The comprehensive plan request is to change from Lake County Future Land Use of Rural Transition and Rural to the City of Leesburg Estate. The zoning would go from Lake County Agriculture to City of Leesburg RE-1. This is one of the last few remaining areas in the City, which is still City Agriculture, and they are requesting to change to the City of Leesburg PUD. The request is for the development of five hundred and eighty-six attached and detached single-family units as seen in the conceptual plan. No substantive comments were received by the city and this is outside the Leesburg electric area. The project is subject to school concurrency. The Lake County Public Works had a number of comments, including sidewalks, a potential traffic signal at CR 48 and Number Two Road, additional right-of-way, left and right turn lanes, and a number of other

requirements. In addition, they had comments about Number Two Road, so the county is fully involved in the expansion of the roadways should this project be approved. They did not receive any specific public comments. The city did request that there be a neighborhood meeting to discuss the project. He thanked the neighbors and the applicants who attended and provided input. Some of those neighbors are present tonight. Under the PUD, the requirements are five hundred and eighty-six single-family homes with a two-floor maximum height. It is a platted subdivision, so the lots would be individually sold. There are no other uses permitted. There will be three sizes of lots: fifty, sixty, and seventy feet with two parking spaces for each unit. Under design and architectural standards, we have the standard architectural requirements of at least five different items that they can choose from a list of about twenty, and they must be applied to each home. There is 35% open space, which is exceeded in their plan. Dark sky lighting is required; significant buffering to adjacent properties is provided in the PUD, including a twenty-five-foot buffer tract around the entire property. The landscape buffers are not part of the lots as this is standard. Signage will consist of decorative entryway features. Again, Bermuda and Bahia grass are permitted. There is to be no St Augustine. A minimum of 2.7 acres is devoted to recreational uses, which includes a swimming pool and cabana with on-site parking, children's playground and gazebos. In addition, there is a requirement for dog parks and trails around the retention areas. If a retention area is dry, it can be used for a field as a play area as long as it is dry most of the year, which we have done in quite a few of the PUDs. The recreation areas have to be constructed by the time fifty percent of the residential units are complete. The entire development has to be on city water and wastewater. We also have the standard phasing or expiration clause. Mike Rankin of the Land Planning Group is here to represent the case along with several members of their team. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the planning and zoning director. He also asked if the commission wanted to hear the presentation from the developer.

Commissioner Burry said one of his concerns is in the middle, because that area will be sitting in the county where the current residents live and those two homes currently have access to Number Two Road. **PZD Miller** stated it would be preserved for them. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to know how they would keep the new folks off Number Two Road. **PZD Miller** replied that there were discussions about this and the last time they talked about it, they indicated that there was to be a gate with some type of keying mechanism or a card reader. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to make sure they were confident that it would work. **PZD Miller** responded they would not be able to get through the gate without some sort of key. However, he could not guarantee it. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that was his main concern because the idea was to keep the traffic off of Number Two exiting on to CR 48. **PZD Miller** informed him that part of the PUD is to preserve their access. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to know if those folks were confident with what had been discussed. **PZD Miller** indicated that he had not talked to them, but the applicants had. **Mayor Reisman** asked the commission if they wanted to see the presentation. By a nod of the head, the commission agreed that they did not need to see it until second reading. He asked if there were any questions for the developer. **Commissioner Burry** stated that was his only concern. He just wanted to make sure everybody was happy. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any public comments.

Sandy Russ of 6813 Lake View Drive, Yalaha, said the reason there were not a lot more people there was because when they met with the developers they told everybody at that meeting that they would not be allowed to speak at this meeting. That was why nobody was there. She called this morning and was told they could speak. She put it out on social media to come to this meeting and provide input. However, she was the only one there with her neighbor. There was a printout on the table at their neighborhood meeting that said no one was allowed to speak at this meeting. They spoke with the developers about a lot of different topics and when he presented it to the planning board meeting, he said it was mainly traffic and people passing illegally on CR 48. We talked about density levels, and the fact that there are no wildlife corridors provided. We talked about traffic, the access points and Number Two Road. We also talked

about the quality of life for the current residents who are encompassed in that and the ones who reside in Trimpi Place. There were discussions about the need for this number of homes. She was not against growth, because it is needed to sustain the city. She had only lived here for five years, and she was so happy to find a lot where she could build her own house because she did not want to end up in one of these types of developments with fifty-foot lots. She likes and prefers rural areas. She moved here from South Dade County. When she grew up there, it was a rural area, and she watched it get destroyed. That was why she moved here. A fifty by one-twenty lot is only six thousand square feet and an acre is forty-three thousand five hundred and sixty square feet. The proposed lots are only fourteen percent of an acre, which is what the majority of the lots would be. The four and five-acre lots are only 2.75% of the development and that is not compatible with the rest of the area. The City of Leesburg Comprehensive Plan talks about compatible densities, so everyone knows what that means. For the surrounding neighbors, this is not compatible. She watched the planning meeting, and she was really surprised that two of the board members said they did not understand the difference between rural and rural transition densities. This area in Lake County is rural. Thank God those board members came out and looked at this area themselves. She also looked at the City of Leesburg Comprehensive Plan to see why they would not understand, and she noticed that it was not defined there. Why is that? Is there no rural land in Leesburg? This is a rural area here and the city has already annexed a lot of this land and there is really nothing to show for it except for a lot of rooftops and traffic. They also talked about housing needs. She wanted to mention that the city's development map was stupendous, and every city should have one because it showed exactly what had been approved, where it was going, how much property it was and what year. What she found in 2020, when she moved here, is that the City had approved, from 2020 to 2025, six thousand five hundred houses east of US 27 south of CR 48. There are about seven developments coming in. Do we really need that many houses here? So she looked at the comprehensive plan, and it says the Leesburg mid-level average estimated demand is for approximately seven thousand three hundred and seventy-four new housing units through 2045. The area that she was talking about east of US 27 south of CR 48 is going to supply almost ninety percent of the city's needs through 2025. So, what is going to happen to those other twenty thousand or so houses that are already approved on the development map? She asked that the commission vote no on this development. **CM Minner** stated for the record that the public is permitted to speak at public hearings. It is an advertised public hearing which is the second reading.

Tom Daly, a representative for the applicant, responded that they had a community meeting. It was held a couple of months ago and what they told them at the community meeting was that there would be a first and second reading. They gave them the tentative dates that the meetings were going to be. We told them that we were not sure if the first reading was going to be open to the public for discussion or whether that would be done at the second reading. They were told to reach out to city staff to determine which hearing was the one that would be open for public speaking. There were no smoking mirrors, and they did not try to deceive them or tell them anything. In fact, they tried to be overly open about telling them what the dates were. They tried to relay to them what they were doing. They did not want the city commission to go away thinking they tried to trick them into something and that they were not supposed to be here. They provided the dates of the meetings, and they were told to reach out to city staff to determine when to come. **Mayor Reisman** thanked him for those comments. He asked if there were any further comments. There were none.

2. **An Ordinance amending the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Leesburg, changing the Future Land Use Map Designation of certain real property consisting of approximately 91.07 +/- acres; and being generally located south of CR 48 and east of Number Two Road, lying in Sections 17 & 20, Township 20 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Lake Margaretta**

LSCP)

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to transmit this item to the state for review, and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission approved the transmission to the state.

3. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 196.07 +/- acres from Lake County A (Agriculture), City RE-1 (Estate Density Residential) and City A (Agriculture) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow for 586 detached single-family residences, for a property generally located south of CR 48 and east of Number Two Road, lying in Sections 17 & 20, Township 20 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Lake Margaretta PUD)**

C. NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:

1. **None**

7. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS:

The following reports are provided to the Commission in accordance with the Charter/Ordinances. No action required.

A. Financial Reports as of April 2025

Mayor Reisman asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the financial reports. There were none.

8. CITY ATTORNEY ITEMS:

CA Watson had no items to comment on.

9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

CM Minner had no items to address.

10. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Connell had no further comment.

Commissioner Burry had no comment.

Commissioner Pederson had nothing to comment on.

Commissioner Berry thanked Officer Riley Snavelly, Dianne Yekel, and Dan Miller for their time. She was able to get some much-needed knowledge and understanding of how code enforcement works in the city.

Mayor Reisman stated that tomorrow night at the Leesburg Lightning game they are hosting first responders night. Our police and fire departments will be there, and we will watch our chiefs throw out the first pitches. There will be SWAT trucks, fire trucks and police vehicles there. It will be a fun night for the kids, and it will be a good family atmosphere. He hoped to see everyone there.

11. ADJOURN:

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES NEEDING ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THESE PROCEEDINGS SHOULD CONTACT THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT, ADA COORDINATOR, AT 728-9740, 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

F.S.S. 286.0105 "If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the Commission with respect to any matter considered at this meeting, they will need a record of the proceedings, and that for such purpose they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based." The City of Leesburg does not provide this verbatim record.

With a motion by Commissioner Pederson and a second by Commissioner Berry, the meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.