

**AGENDA MINUTES
CITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET
MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2025 5:30 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, October 13, 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
Mayor Alan Reisman

Commissioner Mike Pederson was absent. 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

Mayor Reisman gave the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Before moving to proclamations, Mayor Reisman informed the audience that agenda items 6.A.4, 6.A.5 and 6.A.6 (Royal Highlands) will now become agenda items 6.A.1, 6.A.2 and 6.A.3; and agenda items 6.A.1, 6.A.2 and 6.A.3 (Oak Ridge) will now become 6.A.4, 6.A.5 and 6.A.6. The Royal Highlands cases will be heard first.

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

2. PROCLAMATIONS:

A. White Cane Day

Mayor Reisman read a proclamation proclaiming October 15, 2025, as White Cane Day in the City of Leesburg, and he encouraged all citizens to recognize and celebrate the contributions of people who are blind or have low vision, to share the road safely — stop and yield to pedestrians using a white cane or guide dog and to support organizations that advance accessibility, inclusive design and equal opportunity.

3. PRESENTATIONS:

A. NONE

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!

Gary Sligh of 1012 West Main Street said he was the treasurer for the Downtown Leesburg Business Association. At the last meeting, the commission was kind enough to help them out with funding. He was there to report on a couple of things they had going on. First, the scarecrows are up around downtown. There was a great turnout. He thanked RoMac Lumber for providing resources and Mini-Split King, which is a new business downtown because they did the construction of the scarecrows. That event is a long-standing tradition, and they took it over from the Partnership. Another thing they have done recently was to revive the downtown Leesburg map. It can be found at all the local businesses downtown. He also provided copies for the commission to review. When the Partnership folded, they asked the DLBA to take it over. It has taken them a little while, but they are there now. He thanked the commission for their support.

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 Burry 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 Berry	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

Four 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. Regular meeting held September 22, 2025

B. PURCHASING ITEMS:

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a service contract with Odyssey Manufacturing Company; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,132

2. **Purchase Request for One (1) Standby Generator in the Amount of \$176,809.82 from Ring Power, Utilizing Sourcewell Contract #092222-CAT.**

APPROVED

3. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Enterprise Agreement with ESRI, Inc. for the City's GIS Software for a period of three (3) years and a total cost of \$126,600; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,133

C. RESOLUTIONS:

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, authorizing the Leesburg Fire Department to apply for, and if awarded, accept the Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) from FEMA, for the purchase of cardiac monitor/defibrillators; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,134

2. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an agreement to extend the Leesburg Police Departments contract with Motorola Solutions for five (5) years as it relates to the Body Worn Camera (BWC) program; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,135

3. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a lease agreement with LAMAR Advertising; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,136

4. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement to the City of Leesburg from Leesburg Senior**

Living Partners, LLC., for the purpose of granting the City an easement over the property described therein; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,137

- 5. Resolution of the City Commission of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Electric Service Agreement between the City of Leesburg and Hills of Leesburg 118, LLC., regarding electric service to a development known as Oakstone Farms; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,138

- 6. 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 Marietta MHC, LLC., regarding electric service to a development known as Leesburg Estates; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,139

- 7. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Civic Organization Funding Agreement for Fiscal Year 2025-26 with Leesburg Cemeteries, Inc.; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,140

- 8. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement to the City of Leesburg from Belle Rive Ventures II, LLC., for the purpose of granting the City an easement over the property described therein; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,141

- 9. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement affecting the property described therein from CWIII LLC, joined by UNITED SOUTHERN BANK; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,142

- 10. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the First Amendment to the Gas Service Agreement between the City of Leesburg and Cedar Landings, LP, regarding offsite development for the provision of natural**

gas service to the development known as Blue Cedar Phase 1; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,143

11. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida amending Resolution No. 11,372, amending and adopting modifications to the City of Leesburg Surplus Lot Donation Policy; establishing revised policies and procedures; and providing a new effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,144

12. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, amending Resolution 12,091 pertaining to the 457B Employer Match; Modifying the Employer Match to be placed within the 401A General Employees Retirement Plan and/or the 457B Deferred Compensation Plan; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,145

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 7.53 +/- acres; and being generally located west of U.S. Highway 27 and south of Florida Turnpike, lying in Section 18, 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. (ANNX Royal Highland)

DENIED ORDINANCE 25-60

Mayor Reisman asked the city attorney to perform the swearing-in. **CA Watson** asked anyone wishing to speak on any of the public hearing items, including the Oakridge PUD rezoning, Royal Highland PUD rezoning, 937 East Main Street rezoning, Legacy Commerce SPUD, and the Leesburg Lakefront PUD rezoning to stand and raise their right hand. He swore them all in.

Commissioner Burry 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 this project consisted of an annexation, small-scale comp plan, and rezoning. The site is 7.53 plus or minus undeveloped acres. It is generally located on the west side of US 27, south of Royal Highlands Boulevard and the Florida Turnpike. The request is for future development of a project consisting of forty-eight attached single-family residential units, which generally means town houses. The comprehensive plan is requesting a future land use amendment from Lake County Urban Low Density to City of Leesburg Low Density. The zoning change is from Lake County Planned Unit Development to City of Leesburg Small Planned Unit Development. With the comments received, the Lake County School Board noted that if it was developed as a fifty-five-plus project, it would not be subject to school concurrency. If it was not developed as a fifty-five-plus age project, then it would be subject to school concurrency. Lake County Public Works had no comments. Under public responses, the project was advertised, posted, signs were placed along the property and letters were sent to the surrounding property owners. There was significant public input that included traffic, project density, property values, compatibility, wildlife, environmental crime, etc.

Under the SPUD requirements for this proposal, it consists of a total of forty-eight single-family attached units, again, town homes. For clarification, a town home is where you purchase the land underneath the home as well as the property within the walls of that home. They are just attached. They are not condominiums or apartments. There are no commercial uses permitted under this proposal. The lots would be twenty feet wide with a minimum living area per unit of 1,100 square feet and two floors being the maximum height. There will be at least two off-street parking spaces required for each unit. The project includes design and architectural standards which are shown in the SPUD and include a minimum of 35% of open space, dark sky lighting, and trees are required between each driveway. There is a twenty-five-foot landscape buffer required except for where it is not needed due to existing wetland areas. There is a fence required along the perimeter except for where wetlands are present and sidewalks are required throughout the development. Of course, Bahia or Bermuda grass is permitted instead of St. Augustine due to its excessive water usage. Site access was shown on the site plan and, because US 27 is under FDOT authority, the developer will have to provide for any and all expansions or upgrades required for the entry and roadways as requested by FDOT. There is a right in/right out access point only on US 27. He pointed out that there would be no inter-connectivity to the adjacent subdivision. There are recreation requirements consisting of at least 18,000 square feet of active and passive recreation space, which includes a pavilion, dog park, outdoor cooking facilities, tot lot, and other similar uses. There is a requirement for all the development to be on City of Leesburg water and wastewater services. There will be no wells or septic on the property. Through the review process, the city public works department indicated that there was sufficient capacity to serve the development. They also included the phasing or expiration clause, which requires that the development moves forward within forty-eight months, or it would revert to the RE-1 zoning district requirements. It would remain a PUD, but it would fall under the RE-1 zoning requirements, which is one acre per unit. Tom Daly, Bill Maki, and others were present from Daly Design Group to answer any questions, along with Carolyn Haslam, who is the attorney for the project. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the planning and zoning director by the commission? There were none.

Tom Daly of Daly Design Group, 913 North Pennsylvania Avenue, Winter Park, said they were there on behalf of the property owner, GKO Development. He wanted to briefly go through the PowerPoint presentation that was provided at first reading. The development is seven and a half acres, and they are requesting that it be annexed into the city. As part of that, they would like to amend the future land use and the zoning from Lake County Commercial C-1 to the City of Leesburg SPUD. They are proposing to downzone the property from commercial to a residential use.

Referring to a slide, he showed a blue line, which represented the ISBA boundary line. They would utilize city water and sewer, which also serve the Royal Highland community. The Royal Highland development has been around since 1994. The original approved master plan was approved for 1,500 residential units, three hundred recreational vehicle parking, and 5,000 square feet of retail/commercial space. In 2005, the master plan was amended by the master developer, who was Pringle. They took the commercial property and deeded that portion of the property, which was located at the intersection of the main entrance into the community and deeded it to the HOA for a softball field. At that time, they took the commercial that was currently approved on the corner and moved it south and changed the zoning. The access easements were recorded which he would go over. Another portion of the former commercial property was deeded to the homeowner's association in 2009, to construct pickleball courts. The property was ultimately purchased by his clients in 2023. Again, 1,500 single-family homes were part of the original approval, which was shown in red. He showed where the commercial was, it was shown in purple. He pointed to the site that they were looking to have annexed into the city, and they also wanted to amend the future land use.

Moving to another slide, he showed the original approvals, which included softball fields. The pickleball courts were deeded over to the homeowner's association and the purple area on the slide was converted from residential to commercial. At that time, there were 1,500 homes approved, 300 recreational vehicle parking spots and a commercial. Since that portion of the property was bigger, it was approved for 49,500 square feet of commercial uses in the county.

Referring to another slide, he said the proposed site has been pretty well cleared. There is an existing pond located within the property which serves a portion of the Royal Highlands development. It was also designed to serve this property. There was a berm constructed, but they were not sure when it was constructed. That was done before their time, but it was constructed by the master developer as a screening between the Royal Highland development and this seven-acre parcel, which is located on the frontage of US 27. In order to have a commercial development of 49,000 square feet, based on city and county codes, they would be required to have one hundred and ninety-eight parking spaces to serve that development. If they were to proceed in the county with a commercial development, it would encroach onto the existing pond. It would also encroach onto the existing berm, and they would have to pave almost the entire property.

Moving to another slide, he showed the conceptual site plan. It would still go through city and engineering review. Essentially, they are proposing to leave the existing berm and pond because there are homes right behind the berm. They would focus on the development between the berm and US 27. They are not proposing a wall on US 27 because there would be a landscape berm along the frontage. Again, that is the current conceptual plan. He was not sure if anyone had driven by the site, but it had been fairly cleared and maintained. There are no structures on this site. With the berm that has been there for quite a long time, because the vegetation has grown quite a bit. Based on their survey, it is a four-to-five-foot berm and the trees are between twenty and thirty feet tall. It is clearly heavily vegetated. He showed a view from the back of the berm from the Royal Highland. He pointed out the grassy area which was owned by the developer/his client. The view from the existing community towards the berm and beyond is seriously buffered. It has grown, so a buffer does exist. They are proposing a small recreation area to

include a pickleball court, dog park, and picnic pavilion. There would be a total of forty-eight homes versus the 49,500 square feet of retail/commercial. The townhomes would have metal roofs because they are custom designed. They were being designed specifically for this community. This developer is not a national builder. They are a local builder that builds commercials, apartments, and town homes.

At the last meeting, there were a few items brought up which he wanted to address. First was about the traffic between commercial and residential. They had their licensed traffic engineer prepare a memo that was presented to city staff. Based on that memo, the number of daily trips for a town home development would be about 552 and retail/commercial would be about 3,236 daily trips, which is significantly more. They believe that the traffic impacts would be significantly less besides the common sense of a strip center versus forty-eight town homes. The other item that was brought up was with regard to the access easements which are already in place and that would provide this site with access from Monarch Boulevard and Royal Commerce. He asked their attorney to come and provide a summary of that.

Carolyn Haslam of Akerman, 420 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, said she reviewed the access easement and although it was drafted at the time that the property was to be developed as commercial, it did mention in the recitals that there were no restrictions or requirements throughout the document that require that this property be retail, commercial or anything. The easement has been given specifically to the property, and there were no termination or restrictions on that. She also spoke with the city attorney about it and the Florida law does allow for them to use that easement. **CA Watson** remarked that he did review the easement, and he did not see anything that indicated that the use of the property benefited by the easement had to be commercial. It runs along the land, and it benefited the successors, which was signed by Pringle at the time. He did not see anything that clearly limited the scope of the easement or the ability to utilize the easement with that parcel being commercial. Unless it is specifically stated in an easement, they will not have any type of restriction. However, that was what he understood after reviewing it.

Mr. Daly said they believed that they did have legal access to the property, which was an issue that was brought up because some folks felt they did not, but they do. They also reached out to the school board with regard to school capacity and the school board determined that the size of the development would be considered de minimis. There would not be enough kids coming from this development if children lived there for the school board to have any concerns. With that, they were asking for annexation of the property which is in the ISBA. They have every right to do it and the city has every right to accept. They were asking to downzone this property significantly from 49,500 square feet of commercial to forty-eight town homes. That is a huge drop in any impact, whether it be water, sewer, schools or roads. It is all a dramatic reduction. Again, they were there asking the city to approve their SPUD. He would like to reserve time to respond to any public comments.

Mayor Reisman asked if there were any questions for the developer. There were none. He then asked the city attorney to talk about the letter they all received from the county regarding this application. **CA Watson** stated that all commissioners received a letter from the county, which was sent out on Friday that raised a question about this particular application. As the planning and zoning director mentioned, this was being annexed pursuant to the ISBA. There are statutory requirements attached to the process in addition to the ISBA. One requirement dealt with non-contiguous property, which requires the city to do one of two things. They either have to send the proposed comprehensive plan amendment to the state for review and comment on before the annexation is approved or there needs to be an existing joint planning agreement (JPA) between the city and the county. However, there is no existing joint planning agreement, so the only option that the city has is to transmit the comprehensive plan amendment to the state before annexation. However, as he understands, that has not happened, so if the city were to move forward tonight and approve this annexation, there would be a question about whether the statutes have

been followed. He suggested that they do a continuance so that everything could be sent to the state. If the commission moved forward with the annexation, they would need to verify that the application was sent to the state for review and comment. At this time, it does not appear that it was sent to the state for review, which is what that letter was referring to. **Mayor Reisman** thanked the city attorney for that clarification.

Commissioner Connell wanted to know if they could just vote on the annexation to see if they even wanted to move forward with this before getting into the rest of this. **CA Watson** said they could vote, but any yes vote would need to be contingent on sending it to the state to see what the state's review would be. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to confirm that they could go ahead and have a vote on the annexation to see if they even wanted to move forward with submitting. **CA Watson** said they could treat it to an extent as they do with transmit hearings where they could have a vote before deciding to transmit. That process is not necessarily spelled out in the statute, but under the circumstances that they could proceed that way.

Commissioner Connell made a motion to call the question to see if the commission even wanted to move forward with this annexation, and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

CM Minner stated for clarification, Commissioner Connell is changing the motion on the table. Right now, the motion on the table is to approve the annexation. However, Commissioner Connell has called a question, which would be to vote for annexation. If there are more yes votes than no, they would need to revisit that. They need to vote on Commissioner Connell's call to question to immediately vote on the annexation question. They would need to vote to call the question and, if that is affirmative, they would vote on the motion to annex. **Mayor Reisman** agreed. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to clarify that they were calling a question. **CM Minner** explained that the call to question meant they would move immediately to consider whether to annex the property. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to clarify that if they did not want to annex it, would that be a yes vote? **CM Minner** pointed out if the commission chose not to talk about it anymore, they could move to vote. A yes vote meant that they would move straight to a vote on the annexation. **Mayor Reisman** agreed.

The roll call vote was:

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

Four yeas, no nays, the Commission approved the call to question.

CM Minner stated there were four votes to call the question and the question on the floor was whether to annex. If they want to annex the property, they would vote yes. If they did not want to annex, they would vote no. If there are more yes votes than no votes, they will have to consider whether they transmit.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Berry	No
Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Burry	No
Mayor Reisman	No

No yeas, four nays, the Commission denied the ordinance.

CM Minner stated that with the failure of the motion, they would not hear the land use or the rezoning ordinances. **CA Watson** clarified that those two items have now become moot based of the annexation vote failing. **Mayor Reisman** pointed out to the audience that the Royal Highland cases failed. It will not be happening. He called a five-minute recess at 6:02 p.m. and reconvened at 6:06 p.m.

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 7.53 +/- acres from Lake County Urban Low Density to City of Leesburg Low Density Residential, for a property generally located west of U.S. Highway 27 and south of Florida Turnpike, lying in Section 18, Township 21 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (SSCP Royal Highland)**

DENIED ORDINANCE 25-61

This ordinance became moot due to annexation failing.

3. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 7.53 +/- acres from Lake County PUD (Planned Unit Development) to City of Leesburg SPUD (Small Planned Unit Development) to allow for a townhome community for a property generally located west of U.S. Highway 27 and south of the Florida Turnpike, lying in Section 18, Township 21 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (SPUD Royal Highland)**

DENIED ORDINANCE 25-62

This ordinance became moot due to annexation failing.

4. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 596.29 +/- acres; and being generally located east of County Road 48 and south of Ronald Reagan Turnpike, lying in Sections 28, 29, and 32, 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. (Oak Ridge ANNX)**

TABLED ORDINANCE

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 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 this project included an annexation, large-scale comprehensive plan and rezoning. The site consists of 596.28 plus or minus undeveloped acres. It is generally located on the east side of CR 48, and south of the Florida Turnpike. The request is for the future development of nine hundred and ten attached and detached single-family residential units with associated amenities. Under the overall proposal, the comprehensive plan request would go from Lake County Rural to City of Leesburg Estate and the zoning would go from Lake County Agriculture to City of Leesburg PUD. Under the PUD requirements, the proposal consists of nine hundred and ten single-family units which are split into two home types. There would be six hundred and forty-two detached single-family homes and two hundred and sixty-eight villas, which would be duplexes. There are no other uses permitted. Breaking it down further on the attached units, there would be two hundred and sixty-eight villas on thirty-five-foot lots, which means the villas would be on a seventy-foot lot and each side of the duplex would be on a thirty-five-foot lot, with a minimum house size of 1,200 square feet. So that entire villa would be a 2,400 square foot building, and each unit would be a 1,200 square foot within the duplex. Of the detached units, thirty-seven units would be on seventy-foot lots, which would be located on the perimeter areas of the property. Those would have a 1,800 square foot minimum house size. Then forty-six units would be on sixty-foot lots with a 1,700 square foot minimum house size. The remaining five hundred and fifty-nine units would be on fifty-foot lots with 1,500 square feet of living area. There are design and architectural standards required in the PUD. Two floors maximum height, two off-street parking spaces for each unit and 35% minimum open space, but this proposal has significantly more than that. It does include dark sky lighting, trees in each yard, and a twenty-five-foot landscape buffer is required along the entirety of the property boundary except for where wetland areas exist. There would be a three-foot berm with a four-foot fence along CR 48 and a perimeter fence is required except for where a berm or wetland is present. Sidewalks are required throughout the proposed development and Bahia or Bermuda grasses are permitted instead of St Augustine. Site access is shown on the site plan and there will be three main access points, and they will all be boulevard entrances with a landscape median of at least eight feet in width to allow enough lane area for emergency vehicles to turn around and maneuver if needed. Signage would have decorative entry features of concrete block, brick, stucco, wall or a sign within the median area of the roadway of at least five feet high. There is interconnectivity to the adjacent subdivisions to the east which would complete the development proposals from CR 33 to CR 48. They could drive through the neighborhoods to go from one road to the other. There are 4.18 acres of recreation required that include a pool, cabana, children's playground, dog park and there is a very extensive walking trail being provided along the wetlands areas. Everything has to be on city water and wastewater. There will be no wells or septic. They included the standard phasing clause of four years, or it would revert to the RE-1, which is one acre per unit. Logan Opsahl of Lowndes, Doster, Kanter and Reed is here to represent the case and answer any questions. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the planning and zoning director. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that the commission had received a second letter from the Lake County Board of County Commissioners with regard to this property. He asked if they wanted to talk about that now or wait. **Mayor Reisman** replied that they would talk about that after the developer provides his presentation. **Commissioner Burry** said that would be fine.

Logan Opsahl of Lowndes Law, 215 North Yola Drive, said he would be brief as they were there for a second reading. He wanted to address a couple of key items, and he would be happy to answer any questions. Referring to the slides, he showed the overall assemblage of the property, which was a bit different from what they saw in the planning and zoning director's presentation. This property is bounded by city property and the outline shows the future land use map of the City of Leesburg. He showed a zoning map which was surrounded by either a planned unit development or an age-restricted development, which is located right across CR 48. He showed some of the other developments in the

immediate vicinity that included their densities. The quick history of this property is that it had some cattle operations and in more recent years it was used for sod stripping. One thing to consider given the sod stripping activity was that when it rained or when it was dry, this property either had dust or significant water runoff. As they look to develop this property, storm water considerations, natural vegetation, water clarity, water purification through that natural process are important components for the build-out of this project. With the amenities, although there are required minimums, there are extensive multi-use trails throughout the wetlands, which they view as an amenity to the overall project. Those include nature trails, neighborhood parks, activity centers, but that multi-use trail will run along the wetlands as an amenity for the residents.

Moving to the conceptual renderings of the project, they can see green and blue areas. The green represents significant wetlands, so this property, given the shaping of it, is to track the upland areas while the wetland portions remain and the water as well. This project creates some wetlands in key areas. The PUD ordinance has a minimum open space requirement that was outlined by staff. What is before them is about double that because they will have about 70% open space and the natural vegetation buffers will improve the water quality. It buffers the wetlands, and it is a habitat for wildlife. It is an overall enhancement for stormwater treatment. With the pedestrian trails and boardwalks, following a community meeting, they showed an extensive boardwalk that reached that portion of the assemblage that runs to the east out towards Clear Lake. Since that meeting, they have removed that amenity so it will not encroach on any view shed. He wanted to make sure they clarified that the boardwalk had been removed, and that it would not be included. He was happy to answer any questions, and he would like to reserve some time to respond to questions.

Mayor Reisman stated he wanted to refer to the city attorney to talk about the letter they received. **CA Watson** pointed out that there was a second letter that the commission received from the county commissioners that addressed a question about roadway maintenance and the ISBA. The county has also raised a question or a recommendation that if the city annexes this property, that the city take over the maintenance of CR 48 from CR 27 to the Sumter County line, which is a pretty significant stretch of road. The county did not necessarily give any real justification or support for why they made that request. He did ask for clarification about whether, if this property was annexed into the city, it was the county's position that the city would be required to take over maintenance of CR 48 from US 27 to the Sumter County line and, at this point, we have not received any clarification from the Lake County Public Works Department. However, if the property meets the criteria of the ISBA, then yes, the city should take the road over. However, what we do not know is whether this meets the criteria and there are some questions about interpretation. Referring to Section 3E of the 2017 ISBA agreement, it is not a model of clarity, but it does indicate that we are looking prospectively because it states in the agreement that from the effective date of the agreement upon annexation of a sum greater than 50% of the existing frontage of properties abutting any subject road right-of-way that Leesburg shall assume maintenance responsibility for the segment and associated drainage facilities not terminating at any right-of-way center line. It goes on and talks about the city not being required to take over roads that do not meet city standards. However, what we do not have clarity on is where we would measure the roadway from, and if we were excluding properties that were already within the city when the ISBA was signed because we are going from the effective date of the ISBA. He did not know what the county's position was other than it "maybe" meeting the criteria, and if it does, the city should take over CR 48 for maintenance perspectives. **Commissioner Burry** mentioned that he made a comment about the properties that were previously in the city, and prior to the ISBA agreement, Secret Promise was already in the city.

CM Minner pointed out that this was a significant road implication which was part of the things that the commission had to consider during annexation. The county's letter threw a significant wrench in the wheel because it did not have a real legal answer, and it is more of a policy flexation. Having said that

there were two issues this evening, the commission received feedback from Lake County and one was from the county attorney, where she argued legal points about the Royal Highland annexation and the Oakridge annexation. However, those points were from the county attorney, and they argued matters of law. There was another letter that they received from the BOCC, which was signed by Chairperson Campione representing the BOCC, which encouraged, stated, stipulated and recommended that if the city votes to annex this in, then the city would have to take CR 48 from the intersection of US 27 to the Sumter County line. However, given that it is a rural collector, it gives the commission three options to consider for this annexation. First, do not annex it for whatever reason, because that is a legislative item, and they do not have to have a legal reason for not annexing it. Second, annex it and flirt with whatever potential challenge that may come from the county. Third, table it until we get a more definitive answer about what the county's position is on the ISBA. Now, given that they may choose to table this in order to receive a definitive answer from the county on the ISBA, he wanted to share staff's interpretation of the letter, which is from the city's perspective. The city staff, led by him, the deputy city manager, the planning and zoning director and deputy director of planning and zoning met twice with the county staff, which was led by the county manager and the county attorney to review the ISBA. Through those conversations, he expressed to the county that not under any circumstances would the city not need to take CR 48. When the county submitted that letter to us about the roads that they thought we needed to take pursuant to the ISBA (which was referenced by the letter), CR 48 was not on that action list. That indicated to him that the BOCC knows that we do not have to take CR 48. However, he did not know that for a fact because the letter they received stipulated that we may or that we were encouraged to do that. However, at that time, he did not know what that meant.

Referring to a map, he stated the city's position was expressed to the city attorney as well as to the county and the black shaded area is the city limits boundary prior to 2013. That is an important date to remember because, prior to 2013, there was no ISBA agreement. The City of Leesburg entered into two ISBA agreements with the county in 2013, and then we signed a supplemental 2014 agreement. The reference that the BOCC is using in the letter is that if we take portions of annexed area that front county roads, the city has to take those roads. The city's argument back to the county is that in paragraphs 3E and F of the 2014 ISBA agreement it speaks to the road condition. The city staff's position, is that 50% of the frontage of CR 48 was already abutted by city limits. Therefore, when the city entered into the ISBA with the county, that clause in the ISBA agreement could never be tripped. As we annexed areas along CR 48 that were not in the city limits, it would never be more than 50%, because there was already over 50% in the city. Therefore, the city would never be able to acquire 50% of the road frontage, because we already had more than that in the city prior to the ISBA. So, that paragraph does not trip or require the city to take CR 48, and that would be the city's legal argument that our city attorney would argue.

Secondly, we would also have discussions regarding the purpose of county roads and rural collectors, because it is not a legal argument back to us with respect to annexing or that we would have to take it. That is important because if it is the commission's collective decision to annex this property, they need to annex it with some caution in that we may be challenged by the county stipulating that we have to take that road. Remember, once we ring that annexation bell, it will be hard to unring it because we will encumber development, developers and these types of things. He did not know if the commission wanted to do that in the atmosphere that the county had charged us and warned us that if we approved this annexation that we would have to take CR 48. If we blindly annex it, we might have a sticky wicket. If the commission feels they should annex it, but wants delineated clarification from the county before moving forward with the annexation, then the commission should table this item. If the commission does not want to annex it at all, then do not annex it.

Commissioner Berry asked if he could give a landmark for where the Sumter County line was. Is there something there that she could visualize? **CM Minner** answered that other than the Sumter County sign

being a landmark, it is about three miles from the Okahumpka intersection of CR 470, CR 33 and CR 48. If she took CR 48 for about four miles, she would be in Sumter County. **Commissioner Burry** said when he read the letter, it appeared to be written to Leesburg's mayor, and it said it was on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, so this is the official position of the County Commissioners. At least that was his perspective from when he read it. **CA Watson** agreed. That was the indication. When he asked for further clarification about the city annexing this in and if the city would be required to take the road under the county's perspective, he did not receive an answer. **Commissioner Burry** added that the letter was written on Friday, so that did not allow a lot of time to look at it. He asked the city attorney if he had received a copy of that letter. **CA Watson** replied that he received a copy of the Royal Highlands letter, but he did not receive a copy of the Oakridge letter until today. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that this was the kind of stuff that makes it very difficult for them, as city commissioners, to play in the sandbox together with the county when things like this are thrown around. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know about the infrastructure costs. Would the developers take the hit for the costs? Would this be offset by them? **CM Minner** answered that the broad answer is yes. The PUD is written in a fashion that any road development issue they have regarding widening, ingress/egress, they would be responsible for that as a condition to move forward. That is the transportation paragraph in the PUDs and the October 10th letter also references traffic, flooding and stormwater issues. Again, we have said this ad nauseam, time and time again, and without being obnoxious, but the BOCC, as a whole, continues to not read our PUDs because our PUDs specifically state that these things have to be approved prior to a development order. We have already stipulated in the PUD that the roads have to be developed in the way the county requires it. We have already stipulated in the PUD that they have to build the drainage plan pursuant to the district. So, those fears that were stipulated in the letter were already covered in the PUD. **CA Watson** added that there were significant comments on CR 48 coming out of the county. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if the developer was aware of all of this? **Mr. Opsahl** responded that the city manager made a good point and the commissioners, that this letter came out on Friday, and he was not aware of it nor has he put eyes on it. He would be doing his client a disservice if he put this forward to the body for a decision when, quite frankly, it needs more information. In that spirit, they have a vested interest in getting some clarity on this, and it would make a lot of sense to table this item.

Commissioner Berry made a motion to table this item until the City Commission meeting of November 10, 2025, at 5:30 p.m., and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

Commissioner Berry said when this comes back she wants to have all the information in order. She would like to have an understanding of what is expected by the developers for everything the county has listed. **CM Minner** agreed, and he would pontificate on that a little more under his matters.

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 596.29 +/- acres from Lake County Rural to City of Leesburg Estate Residential, for a property generally located east of County Road 48 and south of Ronald Reagan Turnpike, lying in Sections 28, 29, and 32, Township 20 South, Range 24**

East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Oak Ridge LSCP)

TABLED ORDINANCE

Commissioner Burry made a motion to table agenda items 6.A.5 and 6.A.6 for the November 10, 2025, City Commission meeting, and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

- 6. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 596.29 +/- acres from Lake County A (Agriculture) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow 910 single-family attached and detached units, for a property generally located east of County Road 48 and south of Ronald Reagan Turnpike, lying in Sections 28, 29, and 32, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Oak Ridge PUD)**

TABLED ORDINANCE

- 7. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 0.40 +/- acres from City R-2 (Medium Density Residential) to C-3 (Highway Commercial) to correct a 'spot zoning', for a property generally located east of Cloud Street and south of E Main Street, lying in Section 26, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (937 E Main Mellone RZ)**

DENIED ORDINANCE 25-63

Commissioner Burry introduced the ordinance to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinance 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 said this property was located on the south side of East Main Street. It is .4 developed acres. There is a single-family house located on the property now. It is east of Cloud Street, right across the street from the city public works facility. They are requesting a change from R-2, Medium Density Residential to C-3, Highway Commercial. City staff looked at this from the standpoint of cleaning up the zoning map to be consistent with the zoning in the area. As stated at the last meeting, this is spot zoning. It is a situation where one zoning is completely surrounded by another's zoning. The potential uses are

not consistent in the general area. There were no comments received by city departments, the school board, Lake County public works, or the public because it is a straight zoning. There are no conditions, no phasing or expiration clauses. The issue that was spoken about at the last meeting was with regard to the semi-trucks parked there. If the zoning is approved, the trucks can remain. If the zoning is not approved, then the trucks would have to go. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the planning and zoning director. **Commissioner Berry** said she still stood behind her comments from the last meeting. The focus is to enhance the character of the city. Also, code enforcement is doing a tremendous job of making sure that everyone is following the rules and guidelines to uphold the city's look and maintain integrity. She does not agree with doing spot zoning. **Mayor Reisman** commented that he appreciated the staff effort on this, but he also agrees with Commissioner Berry. Code enforcement is doing a good job and there are multiple semis in this area on this property, which is an eyesore, and that is not what we want in that area. He agreed with Commissioner Berry on her comments. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know what the surrounding zoning was around this property. **PZD Miller** replied that the current zoning around it is C-3, and the current zoning on this property is R-2. It became a spot zoning years ago. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to verify that they were only asking for the same zoning that was consistent with the surrounding zoning. **PZD Miller** agreed. **Mayor Reisman** mentioned that the applicant only came to the city for a spot zoning because he has a pending litigation case against him by code enforcement. That was the only thing that triggered this. **PZD Miller** stated that it would clean up a spot zoning that is currently there. **CM Minner** said there was a spot zoning situation, but does the spot zoning issue carry the gravitas of what spot zoning really does and, in this case no. The surrounding area is commercial zoning and allows us to use residential, so even though there is residential next door, the neighbors have built residential in a C-3. Then we have a C-3 being used as a C-3, and we have a C-3 being used as residential. Now, because there is residential next door, that is the conflict. So, whether this is a spot zoning issue is up to the commission to figure out, and unfortunately, that is really the matter. If they want to see the trailers moved, then they should vote no. If they think the trailers are okay because C-3 allows for residential as well as commercial uses, then they should vote yes. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to clarify that the zoning on both sides of this property are zoned C-3, but they are being used for residential properties. **PZD Miller** agreed because C-3 does allow for residential. **Commissioner Connell** continued to say that the property on either side is C-3, but it is being used for residential use. However, if they wanted to put trucks there, they could do that. **PZD Miller** concurred that was his understanding of the code. **Commissioner Connell** then said the zoning on either side would allow for what he is asking for, but it is not being utilized that way, but they could do it. **PZD Miller** agreed. That was his understanding of the code. **Mayor Reisman** added that those properties were used to build Habitat homes. **Commissioner Berry** agreed and said, therefore, do the trucks go or do the homes go? That was how she was looking at it, because they are trying to ensure that they keep the residential areas residential without utility vehicles, RVs and semi-tractor trailers, and if she was not mistaken, there are three trucks parked at that location. These are houses that the commission granted to residents, and they are beautiful homes, but unfortunately, they are in a commercial area. These are located right across from Cutrale and the public works building. So, where do we go from here as a city? **Commissioner Connell** stated that with the zoning on either side, even though they are currently using it for residential it still allows for semi-truck parking. **Commissioner Berry** said it was a residential area because the two homes there make it residential. **Commissioner Connell** remarked that even though it is being used as residential, they could still have a truck there, or they could take that house and turn it into an office building. We have a piece of property that is in the middle of the zoning, and it is currently on both sides. It would not be out of line to provide what he was asking for because either side could do what he was doing. **Commissioner Berry** agreed. That is true because of the way the zoning is set up and the way the habitat homes were provided to the residents. However, for the district that we are trying to convey to other residential areas, you cannot have semi-tractor trailers/trucks parked on the property. **Commissioner Connell** stated the neighbors on both sides of him could park them there now. **Commissioner Burry** said the property itself is where the semis are parked. She wanted to know what

the use of the property was now. What is currently happening on that property? Is there a business being run out of there? **PZD Miller** responded that it was a single-family home. **CM Minner** added that it was zoned residential, and they are putting commercial on it. Everything is inverse. The old zoning was residential, and then we went in, blanketed it and changed things and made it commercial, but they left this lot as residential. Then the surrounding commercial developed as residential because Habitat came in and developed those lots. However, this guy was zoned residential, and it was never changed as the surrounding area was developed as commercial. In this case, the mixed uses are hurting us, and the planning and zoning director's perspective of holistic planning is that it really should be C-3. This is a bit of a quandary, but it has been laid out in the best it could be for the commission. **Commissioner Berry** commented on the history of this site. The family that owned that land worked for Minute-Made, so there was never an issue with walking across the street because it was convenient to work. However, now they are gone, the whole family is gone, and the surrounding land has been donated for Habitat homes, which have been built there. So, how do we enforce the rules for keeping residential as residential when we are in a situation where it is in the middle of a commercial area?

This is something that should be considered, and they are trying to enforce the residential areas to be residential areas. It is very difficult because this is a main corridor for coming into the city, and she sees tractor trailers parked there. **Commissioner Connell** pointed out that those homes were built in a commercial area, so they cannot change that zoning back to residential. It seemed to him that they would be penalizing this property owner by saying he could not have the same zoning that the property on each side of him has. **Commissioner Berry** said the other homes do not have any trucks, but this one does. **Commissioner Connell** remarked that the other homes could still park trucks there and all this guy is asking for is to have the same zoning. They would be isolating him by saying he could not have the same zoning that the property on either side of him has and that does not make a lot of sense. If none of it was zoned commercial, he would agree. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know what would happen if Cutrale became residential. What would we do then? Do we flip back to this one home to accommodate? She was looking into the future, and it seemed that we had allowed one thing to happen, but now they could correct it at this juncture. What if Cutrale was owned by the city, and we wanted to develop and do something else? We would be back at square one by rezoning it to accommodate whatever we are trying to put there. We should be consistent throughout the city and not allow one area to another. **Commissioner Connell** indicated that to him consistency would be to change it to commercial so it is consistent. He wanted to know how many lots, or how far this commercial zoning went? **PZD Miller** responded that the commercial zoning runs all along there. However, this was the only one that was still in the R-2 zoning. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to confirm that they only had this one piece of property amongst about six lots there and that there are several lots there that run from East Street to Lake Street. So, consistency would be to change this one piece to be compatible with the zoning that runs all the way down that strip. **Commissioner Berry** said that would be his opinion. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know what she considers consistency. **Commissioner Berry** said she was asking him to realize that we may, as the city, have allowed things to happen that we probably did not think about at the time. Now we are in a situation where we are trying to be consistent throughout the city, and we have this one area that we have to say: can these trucks remain here and is this a commercial area? However, down the street, two blocks to the right on East Street, those trucks cannot remain there because it is a residential area. **Commissioner Connell** stated that is two blocks away and that is the way zoning works. It is not consistent throughout the city, but it is consistent in the area. He believes consistency is to give it the same zoning as everything else around it. **Mayor Reisman** said they could agree to disagree. He asked if there were any public comments.

Al Malone of 937 East Main Street, said he purchased this property almost ten years ago, and he was not aware that his property was zoned residential with all the commercial properties that surround him. They literally have to look at the public works department, which has been an eyesore for the longest time.

There is a building to the left of that property that has a rusted-out roof. Everything around his property is commercially zoned, and they have not received one complaint in all the years that he has lived there. When the city put up the sign to change the zoning, not one person came to complain. There are people that park RVs around there and people that park whatever they want. Pertaining to this property, the cutout for the curbs in the front are thirty-six feet wide. That curb cradle is thirty-six feet wide, which is large enough to accommodate anything to get in and out of there. They are not infringing on any curbing and there are no parking signs in front of the house which have been there since he purchased the property. He has not changed anything. As a matter of fact, he had improved on it immensely. He was under the understanding that the city gave the property to the people who bought and built the houses, so if they were going to change the zoning, they should have done it then. He was there asking for C-3 zoning, which is commercial, because there are a lot of other trucks coming and going in that area on a daily basis. Yes, they are conducting business out of their home, but at the same time, so is everybody else in that area. They are conducting business in those new homes. However, he did not want to get into that, but he believes some people in the city already know what is going on there. The city did a good thing by donating the property, but they should check with the police department because they would see what has been going on over there. However, he does try to mind his own business, but this area is not as quiet as they may think. Currently, he owns the only piece of property that is residentially zoned and, to be honest that commercial zoning goes all the way up to the tool rental business on the corner of Lake Street. It runs all the way, and it goes beyond because RoMac is there along with the hospital.

Commissioner Berry said she appreciated his comments, but she was well aware of the area. She asked if he would be opposed to parking his trucks somewhere else. **Mr. Malone** answered yes, especially based on what has been happening around his property. Since he has lived there, he has not received one complaint. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other public comments. There were none. He asked if there were any further commission comments.

Commissioner Burry said this was a unique situation, and yes, we have done a good job of giving property to Habitat for residential use, but the zoning, as Commissioner Connell pointed out, is uniform throughout the area. The applicants ask, is not out of character with this area. It was his understanding that if one of those habitat homes wanted to change to a commercial venture, they could do that because it is currently zoned commercial. Technically, we are penalizing him due to the zoning in the rest of the area. He did not like that they have residential zoning and there are semis. Ideally, he gets it and it and it does not look good. **Commissioner Berry** said their due diligence was not done as far as habitat, and she did not believe they can change a habitat home into a commercial area. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that the current zoning is commercial. **Commissioner Berry** agreed that is how it is, but she believed that the habitat program was not setup that way. **Commissioner Connell** stated that once they have their homes paid off, they can do whatever they want with their property. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other commission comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

Two yeas, two nays, the Commission denied the ordinance.

8. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida consenting to the inclusion of the City of Leesburg, Florida, within the Countywide Municipal Service Taxing Unit for the provision of Ambulance and Emergency Medical Services, as adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Lake**

County, Florida; providing for the city to be included within said M.S.T.U. for a specific term of years; providing for conflicts; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-64

Commissioner Burry introduced the ordinance to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinance 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. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

9. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, amending Section 7-170 of the City of Leesburg Code of Ordinances, amending the existing Facade, Sign and Landscape Grant Program, expressing purpose, eligible locations; creating an application process and criteria; setting forth requirements and conditions; implementing procedures; repealing conflicting ordinances; providing a savings clause; and providing for an effective date.**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-65

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

Commissioner Connell mentioned for the record, he spoke with the city manager about this, but to confirm no properties will be eligible for this grant if there are existing code violations on the property. Obviously, the intent of this was to clean up the property, and he would hate to see the city give away \$30,000 to \$50,000 for a sign when they have two stories of used tires stacked behind it. **CM Minner** agreed. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other commission or public comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Burry	Yes
--------------------	-----

Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Mayor Reisman	Yes

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

10. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, regulating City of Leesburg Water and Wastewater Capacity Impact Fees; providing for legislative findings and intent; adopting a Water and Wastewater System Impact Fee Study dated September 4, 2025, as amended; Amending Chapter 22 - 'Utilities' of the Code of Ordinances relating to Water and Wastewater Utility Impact Fees; providing for codification and scrivener's errors; providing for conflicts; providing for a savings clause; providing for severability; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-66

Commissioner Burry introduced the ordinance to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinance 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. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES:

1. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 7.3 +/- acres; and being generally located west of U.S. Highway 27 and north of University Avenue, lying in Section 24, 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. (Legacy Commerce ANNX)**

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 for the Legacy Commerce Center. It includes an annexation, small scale comp plan and rezoning for 7.3 acres on the west side of US 27 and south of University Avenue. The request is for approval of a future development which consists of 50,200 square feet of multi-use office and warehouse buildings. The future land use application request would go from Lake County Urban Low to City of Leesburg General Commercial and the zoning would go from Lake County Agriculture to City of Leesburg Small Planned Unit Development. Under the conditions of the SPUD agreement, 50,000 square feet of office and multi-use type spaces uses that could include office, warehouse, mini warehouse, industrial, flex space, indoor light manufacturing, building trades and contractors with indoor storage, daycare and private school as the location is near residential development. The design standards include screening of mechanical equipment, 35% open space, dark sky lighting, a landscape plan review is required, and a two floor maximum height, which is consistent with what is permitted in the area. Since US 27 falls under FDOT authority, any changes to the roadway access points would be required to be made by the developer along with all expansions etc. This development would be required to be on city water and wastewater. They included the phasing clause into the PUD. J. B. Bricklemeyer was present to represent the applicant and to answer any questions.

J. B. Bricklemeyer of 17032 Johns Lake Drive, Winter Garden, said he was there on behalf of the owner as legal representation. He was there to answer any questions the commission may have. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the applicant. There were none. He said this item would lay over.

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 7.3 +/- acres from Lake County Urban Low to City of Leesburg General Commercial, for a property generally located west of U.S. Highway 27 and north of University Avenue, lying in Section 24, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Legacy Commerce SSCP)**
3. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 7.3 +/- acres from Lake County A (Agriculture) to City of Leesburg SPUD (Small Planned Unit Development) to allow for 50,200 square feet of Multi-use Office/Warehouse buildings for a property generally located west of U.S. Highway 27 and north of University Avenue, lying in Section 24, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Legacy Commerce SPUD)**
4. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 20.36 +/- acres from City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) and C-3 (Highway Commercial) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow for a mixed-use development, for a property generally located north of U.S. Highway 441 and east of Pemble Road, lying in Section 20, Township 19 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Leesburg Lake Front**

PUD)

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

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller said this project has a former PUD zoning for an RV Park. It would basically go from PUD and C-3 to PUD. They are requesting 278 multifamily units. However, keep in mind there were currently 250 spots for RV units in the previous PUD. They would add 12,000 square feet of commercial uses, a 2,800 square-foot clubhouse, boat house, and associated amenities. There would be no change to the future land use. It is strictly a rezoning from PUD to PUD with revised conditions. City staff did not receive any substantive comments from the city departments. The school board said it would be subject to concurrency review. We did not receive any written responses to the ads or letters. Looking under the PUD requirements, it would have 278 multifamily units with 12,000 square feet of commercial uses. The commercial uses would be based on the C-3 highway commercial zoning district. There would be a four-floor maximum height on this to create a view of Lake Griffin along with two off-street parking spaces for each unit as required by code. There are design and architectural standards in the PUD that include 35% open space, dark sky lighting, and a landscaping plan is required. We are including a thirty-foot buffer along the western side of the property right along the boundary. Along the western side of the property there would be a four-foot berm with a six-foot privacy fence installed. They would literally have a ten-foot-tall buffer. It would be the same as what was in the previous PUD. There is also a twenty-five-foot landscape buffer along the southern property line which runs along US 441. The standard PUD requirements include the Bahia or Bermuda grass and sidewalks. There will be two separate access points in the development and FDOT would require any upgrades to the property access points. There will be 1.4 acres of active recreation areas which include a swimming pool, walking trail, children's playground and dog park or similar. Again, everything will be on city water and wastewater and the utility department has indicated that there is capacity to serve with water and wastewater. They also included the phasing clause which they have in all the PUDs that would revert this to RE-1 after four years. City staff sees this as a significant upgrade from the current zoning, which was the RV park. They would turn this into apartments with a view. There is a potential there for a marina or something like that. Also, there may be one place where people can get gas on Lake Griffin. **Commissioner Burry** indicated that the only spot he knows of to get gas is up near CR 42, which is quite far. **PZD Miller** stated this was a significant opportunity for that side of the highway. **Commissioner Burry** asked if these were apartments. **PZD Miller** agreed. They would be apartments. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to know more about the apartment sizes. Would there be one, two and three bedrooms? **PZD Miller** indicated that he would have that information for them at second reading. However, he believed they were using the standard numbers that they had always used. **Commissioner Burry** said that they have worked on some in the past, but he wanted to make sure this met the same standards. **PZD Miller** could not recall if it was in the PUD, but he would make sure it was for the second reading. **Mayor Reisman** wanted to know if the marina would be specifically for the tenants. **PZD Miller** responded that there is an ability to do a marina and a restaurant and staff would hate to see it restricted to the tenants only because there could be a lot of business that comes in off the lake. **Mayor Reisman** said he liked that idea. He asked if there were any further questions for the planning and zoning director. There were none.

Mike Rankin, president of LPG, 9013 Silver Lake Drive, said the only thing he would comment on would be that the marina and restaurant would be open to the public. They anticipate more restaurants along US 441 in addition to the waterfront and even though in the title it mentions RV parking, there will not be any RVs on this property. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to verify that he would be okay with the commission taking that RV parking out of the PUD. **Mr. Rankin** replied yes. They have been dealing

with these folks for quite some time. It was inherited, and they convinced them that they would not get RVs there. They decided to switch gears, but the name remained the same. They have been working with the neighbors. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions by the commission and the public. There were none. He said this item would lay over.

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. NONE

8. CITY ATTORNEY ITEMS:

CA Watson had no items to discuss.

9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

A. Update JPA Negotiations with Lake County

CM Minner said the purpose of this time was to provide an update about where the joint planning agreement (JPA) conversations have gone with the county, and to get some feedback from the commission. City staff has met with county staff on two occasions to specifically discuss the concept of negotiating a JPA. The county hosted a meeting two Mondays ago to talk about different things where the BOCC may or may not be looking to do JPAs or transfer development rights (TDRs). He was looking to get some direction from the commission to make sure they were heading down the correct path before ultimately bringing back a document that the commission would approve. If the commission does not want to approve such a document, then he would prefer to veer off from that now. The heartbeat of the JPA conversations for Leesburg has centered around roads and roads being the ones that the city is required to take pursuant to the ISBA, along with roads that the county wants us to take as a part of a JPA. He believes that the county's position is that if we are willing to take the roads, they would be more than happy to give them to us as is. With that, he wanted to digress a little further, because they received a letter dated October 10th that was conflicting because they had already met with county staff on two occasions. We also received a list of roads from county staff that was included in the commission packet and neither that list nor through their conversations with county staff did they say that we had to take CR 48. So, that letter has become slightly problematic. He broke down the county list further and that list was included in the commission packets. He just put it into an easier format which included three sections. The first section includes the roads that we would be required to accept pursuant to the ISBA. In paragraph 3E and F, it says if the city hit 50% of road frontage, we would have to take the road. There is a clear agreement between city and county staff regarding the roads that the city has to take pursuant to

the ISBA, which are Bridges Road, Busby Road, Dewey Robbins Road, Duncan Road, Fernery Road, Number Two Road, Poe Road, and Windmill Road. However, not all segments of those roads were included in the packet because the county put in the start and terminus points for where they would start and end, which were pretty agreeable. Even if the city did not want to take these roads, it would not matter, because we have to. At this point, he would like to get the commission to formally say that they would like to take them. He would then go back to the county manager and the county attorney so they could write up the transfer deeds. They could get that expedited quickly. He asked the commission if they were good with those taking those roads. With a nod of heads, the commission agreed that they were good with that list.

Moving on, the next item on the list is the Windsong subdivision. The Windsong subdivision is an old PUD. He had not looked it up, but it is an odd PUD that we brought in back in the early 2000s. His recollection of that PUD was that the roads and sidewalks stayed in the county even though the city annexed that PUD. Now, that practice has been problematic because the residents of Windsong have complained about the roads and sidewalks. They went and talked to the county and the county told them it was not theirs to fix. They then came to the city, and we told them that we had an agreement that said we do not need to fix them. The correct and right thing to do is to take those roads because they are subdivision roads. They are not connector roads, they are internal roads in a subdivision. They function, look, and act like Maple Street, USA, so the city really needs to take over those roads. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to verify that there was only one way in and out of that subdivision. **CM Minner** agreed. There are about five or six roads in Windsong, but they all connect to Windsong Drive, which hits US 27. He did not believe that all the roads were miserable, and not every one of them would need an overlay. However, they probably need some TLC. So, if the commission would like him to report back on the conditions of those roads before speaking to the county, he could do that. However, he believes they are up against the typical, because some of those roads are about twenty years old, so they may have some potholes, cracks and other stuff that needs to be fixed. Fixing these roads should not break the bank, but he could look at the roads prior to taking them over because that makes practical sense.

Next, he did not include terminus roads in the packet, but he had a map that showed all the roads the county had requested the city consider taking over. He was not going to read the entire list because it was too long. It was in pictorial form, and it did not include what he would call major roads like CR 33, CR 48, CR 470 or CR 44. He pointed out that they were not required to take these roads. However, he was there to ask the commission if they wanted to take these roads. If the answer is that we do not want to take the roads, in his opinion, that kills the JPA, because we really have nothing to discuss. Again, if we do not take these roads, that ostensibly kills the JPA. However, he did not want to go back to the county empty-handed, so he wanted to unveil a concept that is different from a TDR, because honestly, TDRs are not the answer at a city level. With all due respect, TDRs are near and dear to Commissioner Park's heart, but he did not think they would work because, typically, TDRs have been used in more urban counties. He understands the BOCC wants to keep a rural atmosphere in Lake County, and frankly, we all do to a certain extent. However, in places where TDRs have been used have been urban counties where the county has control of utilities and the county is in control of the urban and rural areas. In order for TDRs to work in our setup, we would need fifteen entities, which would be the fourteen cities and the county to agree on certain issues, but the primary one that we would never agree on or that we would struggle to agree on is the receiving area. In simple language, what is a receiving area? If we designate a place where we do not want densities to occur, then the property owners have an option to get the value of their property rights in lieu of sale. That would then have to go through a public hearing process, and they would get a direct card to build in a receiving area. For example, the BarKey PUD when that was done. If we did not want that to develop, they would have to go to the Scales family, and pay the Scales' family "x" dollars, and then we would have to find somewhere else to put 2,000 units. So, where would we put those units, and what is the receiving area? He believed the correct receiving area would be on a

major highway where there are utilities. That is exactly where it is located. Pretty much every one of Leesburg's major annexations is on a highway with utilities. That begs the question of what receiving areas are. Therefore, that is why TDRs become problematic. Again, if we are not going to take the roads, then the bulk of the JPA that we have been discussing will not happen due to us not taking the bulk of the roads.

Now, what can we do, because the problem with the BOCC is that they want to try and mix rural transition areas, urban areas, and rural areas throughout Lake County. He knows Lake County does not want to lose its rural identity, and they do not want to turn into or look like Dade. He did not mean that to be derogatory towards Dade, but could you picture Lake County having one city on top of another city? It would become a megalopolis where municipal corporations meet other municipal corporations. When the ISBA was created back in 2013 and 2014, it was not contemplated. Remember when it was created in 2013 and 2014, we were coming out of a recession. He would pointily say that the BOCC failed to state this in their argument about how the ISBA and the city were not planned correctly, because what the ISBA failed to contemplate in 2013 was that we wanted development, and at that time we were trying to get the economic development motion started. There was no contemplation of protecting a rural area and bands around our ISBAs to protect the sanctity of the county comp plan. The county comp plan has a number of different elements on it, and as a political subdivision they have a different comp plan compared to municipal corporations. We, being the City of Leesburg, are a municipal corporation under the laws of Florida. It is not typical, nor is it legal, for a municipal corporation to have a comprehensive plan that has conservation areas or rural areas, because that is not our business. Even as a city commissioner, if they wanted those areas, he would suggest that they preserve and go where the county commission wants to go, which is to preserve their comprehensive plan, so that it cannot be changed by a municipal corporation's right to annex. Once we annex, we have the statutory right to erase their comp plan and put ours in because that would take away the urban and the conservation areas that we have. If they remember a few months ago, Commissioner Connell brought in the concept of a moratorium policy, and what he was about to tell them was similar to that, in that they do not annex property in certain areas. However, it is completely different from a moratorium because it was not called a moratorium. When they call something a moratorium, they know what happens. It is like dumping gasoline on a fire, because when they throw out the word moratorium, it sends out the notion of a freeze, a stop, and that they do not want any more development. However, he believes they would like to help the county preserve their comprehensive plan.

Now, how do we do that and even though he has said for months that we need to get rid of the ISBA, he is now publicly changing his position. We do not need to get rid of the ISBA, we just need to amend it. We need to amend it by including and recognizing transitional zones that were overlooked in 2013. We do not need to refer to the county transitional zoning because they have it in their 2025 March comp plan where they created a transitional zoning. Frankly, around Leesburg, they will hardly find this transitional zoning, but what they will find is a lot of conservation, rural and low density. So how can we agree to not develop in those areas? We would agree to include no annexation zones within the existing ISBA, so we need to just simply amend the ISBA.

Referring to a map, he said this is what it would kind of look like. No, the map has not been distributed to the public, but it is a public document and it is available. Essentially, the concept would be to have an overlay on the county comprehensive plan and future land use map. For the city, this map looks backwards because the city is represented by the white areas on the map and all the colored areas represent the county. We are used to seeing the city in colors and the county in white, so there is an inverse. However, what it shows is the concept of preserving the county's future land use plan. He pointed out Leesburg and even though they could not see the city limits, they could see the Leesburg ISBA. In his opinion, there are areas where the city could say we will not annex. His suggestion would be

the south portion of the ISBA, which is Bridges Road, Austin Merritt, CR 33 and CR 48. The Oak Ridge subdivision that was discussed earlier is located further up from this area. It would not be located in the no annexation zone, which might be a conversation when he comes back to the commission. However, ostensibly it would be everything that is below what we have taken in less The Villages. He pointed out where the old Secret Promise property was located, which is already located within the city limits. Plus, it has been purchased by The Villages, so it is now an age-restricted Villages development (ARD). He showed another area on the map that was brought in with Secret Promise. They used to call it the Renaissance Trails, which was also purchased by The Villages. Basically, all the big white sections of the map that are not part of the no-annexation zone are The Villages or swampland. The no-annexation zone that they would propose is the bottom tier of southwest Leesburg, which is the area between the Leesburg and Mascotte ISBAs. Mascotte would have to join us and create a no-annexation zone so that between the City of Leesburg and Mascotte boundaries there would be slivers of no-annexation zones, which would preserve the county's future land use map. We would all have to agree that we do not annex that area. Another area that is confrontational for the city as far as growth is the CR 44 corridor. We know there is both good and bad land out there that will develop, and Orange Bend is one of them, which the county gave us permission to develop, but everything that we have not annexed to date, we would say, is a no-annexation zone. That is pretty much everything except for Swan Capital, Hills of Leesburg, and Treasure Trove, which are in as long as we do not get any petitions between now and then, we will carve out that area as a no-annexation zone. In the northwest corner of the community, which is Fruitland Park and Lady Lake, they are not seeing territorial problems with the county, because there really is not a lot of activity going up in that area. At that time, he did not contemplate putting a no-annexation zone there.

However, there are three important points. First, if we do propose this to the county, we have to agree on the no-annexation zones, obviously, us as well as the county, along with the neighboring cities in the hotbed areas. We would all have to agree. If they do not agree, and we agree, that would create some havoc, so everybody will have to share in the preservation of the county's future land use map. The county's hot corner is near the Turnpike and US 27. It would be the county's four corners, where Howey, Leesburg, Groveland, and Mascotte all meet. We have to have joint agreement in the area. For Howey, a lot of the area is already in the Yalaha Apopka RPA. He believes the county would appreciate it if Howey jumped on board, and created that section as a no-annexation zone, because that would protect the RPA. Then Groveland would need to work with Leesburg a little bit, but he did not think Groveland followed traditional municipal urban planning in the aspect of their hamlet's designation. He wanted to put that out there with no disrespect, but that is not how Leesburg is developing, because in Leesburg we have clustered development along US 27 and CR 44, which are areas that the county would call receiving areas. So, we have to work with Groveland on the areas up the US 27/Turnpike corridor that they would preserve. The same goes with Mascotte and all the other entities there. In central western Lake County, they would have a strip of no-annexation zones between Leesburg, Groveland, Mascotte and Howey, which he believes is where the county wants to go. They would like to preserve the county's plan. It is not a moratorium that says no growth, no annexation, it just becomes areas that cannot be developed in Leesburg. So, if a developer were to come in asking to annex this parcel under the plan, the planning and zoning director would tell them that it was a no-annexation zone, and that they would need to go to the county. We also have to recognize that there will be utility issues, but for the most part, the City of Leesburg can serve everything that is in our ISBA. If we agree not to annex, we do not want to give up that territorial right to a city that may be more aggressive than us. That is why the other cities need to come to the table.

With our CUP, we submitted to the district that we have to provide water and sewer to certain areas, which is basically our ISBA box, and we do not want to give up that territory or those numbers to a community who might want to steal it from us if we agree with the county not to annex. They will need to be parties to this. By the way, in order to amend the ISBA, everybody who was a party to the

originally has to come back to the party and everybody has to jointly work together. However, as long as we have the five entities, Howey, Leesburg, Groveland, Mascotte, and the county working together, they could probably accomplish it in this corner because it does not affect any other municipality. To recap, the first thing we need is for everyone to agree to the no annexation zones. Secondly, we all have to respect our 180 rights, which is a statutory reference. The 180 is a statutory reference where municipal corporations can stake out areas inside and outside their boundaries for where they will be the provider of utilities. The county does not have utilities through this agreement, so we would commit to the county as well as the other cities. We would protect our territorial areas and provide what areas may develop in the county. We would provide water and sewer as long as it is financially feasible. That is the second part of the negotiation. That would have to be a reconsideration of the amendment to the ISBA. Thirdly, if this is considered as a taking to the Bert Harris Act or if it is challenged by property owners who might be in the no-annexation zone who may not like the county comp plan and who may be looking in the future to come into municipal corporations to municipalize, then the county would need to defend it. The county will need to defend any type of lawsuit for an amendment to the ISBA that would need to be defended by the county because, in all actuality, that would be the county defending their comprehensive plan, which is not a big ask.

Those are the broad strokes that he wanted to present this evening. If the flavor of the commission is that TDRs and JPAs are not going to work, he does not want to go back to the county empty-handed without another solution to consider. If the commission agrees to move forward with the "have to" roads, they would need to transmit that information to the county. We will also look more into the Windsong roads to see what kind of financial burden we are looking at bringing in. However, we will say no to all the other stuff. So, when we say no to all the other stuff, this would be his big leap, because he would take the liberty to present a red-lined amended version of the ISBA to the county that includes the no-annexation zone proposal. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any commission comments.

Commissioner Berry wanted to know if there were any other cities not willing to do JPAs or TDRs? **CM Minner** responded that Groveland already has a JPA. They had this conversation, and he recommenced right out of the gate that they should not have done the Groveland JPA. He did believe that to be a very friendly city document. However, beyond Groveland, he was not sure where any other JPA conversations were. **Commissioner Berry** inquired about the TDRs because those go hand in hand. **CM Minner** replied that nobody has agreed to do TDRs yet. **Commissioner Berry** mentioned where TDRs seem to really work are in counties with a large urban center, like Alachua County, because they have Gainesville and then a bunch of little communities. We are not like that, so he did not see how that would go forward, because a collector site has to be a big urban site and he did not see that being Leesburg. We are not like Gainesville, because they have about sixty thousand college kids, and they need apartments and all that kind of stuff. He was not a big fan of that part. He has always said to the city manager in their private conversations that we are supposed to look out for Leesburg and, so far on the JPA side, he has not seen what is in it for Leesburg. He personally likes what we have right now. He likes having the ability to do business the way we are now. It had been a good thing for the city, so any further agreements down the road, he would want to know how it would benefit Leesburg. What has been offered so far is that we take all of Sunnyside and take care of the roads out there. However, we do not even own 10% of the roads out there. They want us to take Dixie and SR 44, which is a state road. He did not understand where the list came from because it did not make a lot of sense. **Commissioner Berry** asked if the JPAs and TDRs have to be consistent with the ISBA since it already exists? **Mayor Reisman** answered no.

CM Minner agreed the simple answer is no. They do not have to. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if the goal was to work together and run parallel. **CM Minner** pointed out that we do not want to have three or four different agreements that pretty much say the same thing because that would make it more complex. We just need one agreement that guides how we will all work together, and we already have that agreement in place. That is the ISBA. Now, what is creating the problem, and what is upsetting the

county, is that their future land use map is being overridden by municipal annexations. If we are in agreement not to annex certain areas in our ISBA box, then that creates this band of county comprehensive plan that stays superior for the duration of the ISBA. **CA Watson** jumped in and added that there would be a simplistic aspect to it because we already have the existing agreement. We actually have two existing agreements and instead of blowing everything up and creating a completely new framework. Under this suggestion, they would basically be staying under the same framework that the city has been operating under for ten to eleven years. They would not be changing things dramatically, but they would be addressing some of the concerns that have been talked about among different governmental units. It is an easier mechanism, and a sensible mechanism for bringing about change. As the city manager said, if they create three or four different agreements, we would have to look at all of them to figure out what each agreement is and that is always more complicated. If they just boil it down to what we already have and make some changes, that is the right answer instead of blowing everything up and starting over. **Mayor Reisman** asked if he was looking for a motion to move forward with this. **CA Watson** replied that it would not hurt. The city manager could recap what his request was, but there were three bullet points that he was looking for direction on. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if that did not work with the county, would it come back to them? **Commissioner Burry** asked if the roads that we take are taking. Would that be part of this? **CM Minner** said no, that would be a separate item. The roads that we have to take we will take, but that would be aside from amending the ISBA. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if the county would be considering controlling Leesburg's growth and if that was the goal? **CM Minner** said that was a tricky question because we would say that Leesburg is controlling our own growth, and we are managing it. Whether we are managing it at the whims of the residents or the BOCC, that would be another question. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that we always talk about growth and, for him, all we are doing is planning, because the growth numbers are at 40,000, so we have 40,000 out there. However, remember they are just planned, they are not developed. We are just trying to plan, and he believes this is a good idea. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know what the time frame was for presenting and coming back. **CM Minner** replied that it depends. It could be lickety-split, but it depends on the devil in the details. If everyone buys in to what we are saying, the commission could see it by Christmas, but again, the devil will be in the details, the language, and how we draw the lines. Plus, we need to find out if all the other cities will jump on board. Again, it could be super quick or could be something else that drags on, but this is a pretty consequential shift in the discussions. When the commission says no, that we will not take any more county roads than what we have to take, then the heartbeat of the JPA goes away, but he did not want to go back to the county empty-handed. That way, we would not just be saying no because we are trying to work with them whether they believe it or not. We are trying to come up with a concept that benefits them, not us. However, we need all the other jurisdictions to buy in and if everyone likes it, it will be quick. **CA Watson** added that sticking with the foundation of what already exists definitely helps with efficiency. **CM Minner** agreed, and it would be quicker than a JPA or TDR.

Commissioner Burry made a motion to grant the city manager the authority to contemplate an ISBA amendment with the county to include the no-annexation zones, and Commissioner Connell seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman asked if there were any other comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

Four yeas, no nays, the Commission approved the motion.

10. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Burry had no comment.

Commissioner Connell said he had one thing. He remembered using the words temporary stay for annexations. He did not use the word moratorium. **CM Minner** laughed and agreed. **Commissioner Burry** also laughed and said that was a good one.

Commissioner Berry had no further comment.

Mayor Reisman pointed out that he received an application for the Historic Preservation Board this evening. He wanted to know if they could just appoint him tonight instead of bringing it back to another meeting. Joshua Brewster, who was in the audience, applied for the Historic Preservation Board, and he was looking to see if someone could make a motion to appoint him to that board since there are vacancies.

Commissioner Burry made a motion to appoint Joshua Brewster to the Historic Preservation Board and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman asked if there was any further discussion. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

Four yeas, no nays, the Commission approved the appointment.

Continuing, he thanked the Leesburg Police Department and the Leesburg Special Events division for putting on a phenomenal National Night Out in the downtown. It was absolutely beautiful. Kudos to all of them. There are a couple of events coming up. On October 25th they will be hosting Trick-or-Treat on Main Street. Last year they had about 9,000 people down there. Again, it will be held on October 25th from 4:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. It will be another great event. Then the recreation department will be conducting a haunted house at Mote Morris house starting October 24th through the 26th. He encouraged everyone to do it. It will be another fun event, and it was a great time last year.

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 Burry and a second by Commissioner Berry, the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.