

**AGENDA MINUTES
CITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET
MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2025 5:30 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, December 8, 2025, at Leesburg City Hall. Mayor Reisman called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present:

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

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

INVOCATION

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

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

2. PROCLAMATIONS:

A. None

3. PRESENTATIONS:

A. Leesburg in Bloom Update

Sandi Moore, President of the Leesburg Chamber of Commerce, said she was there to provide an overview of the Leesburg in Bloom initiative and to hopefully get the commission's blessing to move forward.

Referring to the slides, she said the first slide was the new logo. They used the existing city logo and built on that for continuity. They added the Leesburg in Bloom with a magnolia flower. She wanted to show a couple of the projects they are currently working on. First is the storefront planner program. Then they have the library pollinator garden and a community garden. They are planning to do an adopt a park

program where they are trying to get groups together, whether that be businesses or civic groups, to adopt our parks in order to help keep the parks clean, because there are times when the public works department cannot get out there. Then we also have the street banners. They are putting together a volunteer database for all these projects. Some future projects being considered are the gateway entrances, which include neighborhood entrances. They would like to make a more iconic entrance into all the major corridors and then murals.

With the storefront planter program, they would have a couple of different planters for people to choose from. The planters would be bought on their budget. These planters may not be exact colors because there are other colors to be considered. However, they have a reservoir of water in them so they do not have to be watered all the time. The intention here was that if any business wanted to have one of these planters, they would fill out an application and the planter would be free, but they would have to agree to water it. They would also have to put the plants in the planter. There will be uniform plants given as suggestions for each quarter. They would have to agree to change the plants quarterly, but it would be uniform so that the whole city would have the same kind of plants no matter where your business might be. Whether they own a business in downtown Leesburg, the corridors or anywhere in Leesburg, if they would like to do this planter program, they would be eligible. The only other thing about the planter program is that they would have a specific number of planters purchased each year that they could have entered into the program. It might be that they start with twenty planters and if all twenty go out, next year, they would put twenty more out. That way they can keep the costs down initially.

With the library pollinator garden, if everyone can remember when the library was first built, they had a butterfly garden in the back, and the intention of the library was to have that butterfly garden. However, over the years and for different reasons, it lost the pollinators. It does look nice back there, but it does not have the types of flowers that attract butterflies and bees. This was one of the things that they wanted to reestablish. They felt it was an educational opportunity for the library to have, so they could teach about it and its importance because it is obviously good for the environment. In addition to that, they are hoping to work with the Lake County Bee Association. They have already talked to them about the potential of putting hives on top of the library. That way they would have that in addition to the garden. If you were to go to the help desk on the second floor, you would see it behind them. It will be there for people to see.

When it comes to community gardens, we already have some community partners with this; Lowe's Improvement has already donated money and plants which were planted in the town square, and it looks very nice. There are different pots of money to be applied for at different times, and they have to spend that. They have already talked to them about utilizing that for this pollinator garden, and they are willing to donate seeds, plants and other things of that nature when they do come into stock. It is only certain times of the year that they sell those types of plants. Then, of course, the Lake County Bee Association is the other community partner for this. This is one of the projects that can be done at very little cost. The first garden they would like to start would be located at the Leesburg Resource Center. They are hoping to have multiple gardens around the city. They have a wonderful committee working on these projects and one of the committee members is a master gardener. She has already done these gardens in the schools. She provided a stock picture of what the raised beds would look like. They will need volunteers to help, and they do anticipate doing farm-to-table events and educational opportunities to teach residents or anyone how to be able to garden in minimal space. That way they can grow some of their own food even if they have small spaces. The other thing they are hoping to do is address some food insecurities in that neighborhood so that they could come and harvest in order to get food from that garden. Some of the community partners that have been identified for this are RoMac, who offered to supply the wood and supplies needed to construct the raised beds. Black Kow Fertilizer donated the fertilizer for these in addition to the fertilizer for the planters. Then Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity volunteered their time to help

build the beds. They are excited about getting these projects started in the spring as soon as it is good to plant. That way they could start harvesting in the summer. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any comments or questions. There were none. He thanked Ms. Moore for her hard work on this.

B. Employee Service Award Recognitions:

Five Years: Thomas Devereaux, Fire; Brendin Evans, Police; David McClain, Police; and Christopher Moering, Police

Ten Years: Ryan Owens, Fire; and Gabriel White, Police

Twenty Years: Timothy Patten, Public Works; and Sonja Shaffer, Information Technology

Twenty-Five Years: James Green, Police

Human Resource Director (HRD) Melissa Arriaga and **CM Minner** recognized each employee for their years of service and presented them with their service award. **Mayor Reisman** thanked all the employees for their service because they are the backbone of the city.

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!

Bill Polk of 600 Cascade Avenue in Leesburg, Florida wanted to give praise for the parade that was held this past Saturday night. It was a wonderful event. He saw the mayor and the city manager handing out candy to all the kids. However, he was concerned about the traffic in Leesburg. It has been atrocious for some time, yet the city continues to annex property. If he goes to a restaurant or walks down the street, all he hears are complaints about traffic. He mentioned that if they purchase a load of concrete today, they will charge more to deliver concrete in Leesburg than they do in the county. The county has a delivery charge, but Leesburg is charged about twenty percent more than the county. He wondered if that was just because of the traffic. He wondered if FDOT had ever come in to talk because he did not see them here. However, the city needs to get with FDOT to work with them on advancing the roads. It is almost impossible to go from Leesburg to Eustis on CR 44. It is also impossible to Okahumpka. Leesburg, the county, and the state need to figure out how to take care of the roads. Most of the roads in town have potholes, and he did not know if the county was still giving the city money from the gas tax for the roads, because that is what used to happen. It would be great if the city had a summit to talk about the roads with the public. Listening to the public is a good thing, and he was not sure if the city had listened to the public about traffic.

Elise Dennison of Legacy in Leesburg said she was there to discuss the communities that have been approved over the past couple years. She wanted to discuss a sustainability impact assessment for each of the projects. This assessment evaluates the environmental, social, and economic effects of proposed projects or plans, ensuring informed decision-making for long-term sustainability. Among these are roads, schools, medical facilities, job availability, business opportunity, civil protection, fire, police, water supply and protection, possible flooding and pollution resulting from overbuilding. We have seen approvals over the years, but we have not seen any plans for support or sustainability of the expansion.

There will be a time lag between the build start and the sale of the buildings, which would delay the new property taxes coming into the city and the ever-increasing fire assessment fee. The commission should not approve all the development without the sustainability assessments being done prior to each approval. She respectfully requested a town hall meeting to be held after the new year to discuss the documents.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:

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

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

The roll call vote was:

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

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission 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 November 24, 2025**

B. PURCHASING ITEMS:

- 1. Requesting approval to purchase one (1) 2027 medium duty Mack truck, model MD7 for the total amount of \$214,561.00 from Nextran Truck Center, contract holder under the Florida Sheriffs Association Contract FSA 25-VEH23.0.**
- 2. Purchase Request approval for computer equipment from High Performance Technologies using Florida State Contract 43210000-23-NASPO-ACS-FL.**
- 3. Purchase request to approve the purchase to install a new Taraflex Class 3 Sports Flooring with heat welded seams and other updates to the Gym from Southeastern Surfaces & Equipment (SSE) for the amount of \$199,000.00 using Sourcewell Contract ID# 060518-CS.**

C. RESOLUTIONS:

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Agreement to the Florida Gas Transmission FTS-1 contract to provide Natural Gas Transportation Services; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,170

2. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Flagpole Donation and Dedication Agreement between the City of Leesburg and the Leesburg Boating Club, Inc., a Florida not-for-profit corporation; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,171

3. **Resolution of the U.S. Highway 441/27 Redevelopment Agency of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Chairman and Clerk to execute an agreement between the U.S. Highway 441/27 Redevelopment Agency of the City of Leesburg and Habitat for Humanity of Lake-Sumter, Florida, Inc., for the Disbursement of Grant Funds; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 53

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, changing the zoning on approximately 103.14 +/- acres from City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow for 294 single-family detached units, consisting of 241 50' lots and 53 60' lots, for a property generally located east of County Road 48 and north of North Austin Merritt Road, lying in Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Banning 5 PUD)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-72

Mayor Reisman asked that the city attorney perform the swearing-in ceremony. CA Watson asked

anyone wishing to provide testimony on agenda items 6.A.1 (Banning 5), 6.A.4 (Legacy Commerce) or 6.B.2 (Dominium Apartments) to stand and raise their right hand. He swore them all in.

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 stated this was the Banning 5 project. It was for the rezoning of one hundred and three plus or minus acres. It was generally located on the east side of CR 48 north of Austin Merritt Road. The request was for the future development of a two-hundred and ninety-four single-family dwelling unit community. Under the request, the application would go from a Planned Unit Development to a Planned Unit Development with revised conditions. If approved, the project would interconnect CR 33 and CR 48 via the developments that run from the west side of CR 48 all the way to CR 33. City staff reached out today to see if there were any additional comments from Lake County, and they have not heard back from them. However, he would update the commission upon receipt of any comments received. The city had no issues with this request. It is located outside the Leesburg electric area. The school board noted that a mitigation agreement would be required. We received one response to the ads and letters which had concerns about water supply and pollution, wildlife habitat, and increased traffic. Previously, this project was known as the Zellwood property, but that PUD has expired. It allowed a total of three hundred units as compared to the request tonight, which is for two hundred and ninety-four units. Under the previous zoning (just for comparison) it was broken down into one hundred and fifty-two town homes and one hundred and forty-eight single families. What we would be getting is essentially the same density with a difference of six units. Under the terms of the proposed PUD agreement, there would be two hundred and ninety-four single family units. There are no other uses. The site plan would allow for the exterior lots to be sixty feet wide, seventy-five hundred foot lot size and the minimum house size is seventeen hundred feet. The interior lots would be fifty feet wide with a minimum of sixteen-hundred square foot homes and sixty-two hundred and fifty square foot lot sizes. The project proposal includes design standards, which includes selecting five design features for each building frontage that come out of the design standards in the PUD. There are buffers required around the entirety of the project, dark sky lighting, thirty-five percent open space minimum, and a landscaping plan. The maximum height is two floors, which is consistent with all the other developments in the area. Plus, the usual Bahia or Bermuda grass is required in place of St. Augustine. There is site access through there on CR 48, which is under Lake County authority, so the developer will be required to provide any and all upgrades, changes, widening, turn lanes, signalization, anything like that and our PUDs are written to support that. There are 1.35 acres of recreational uses that are required. That would be a primary recreational area with three amenities. In other words, it would include a pool plus two other features, such as barbecue grills, play areas, ball courts or picnic tables. The utilities are provided by the city except for electric, and there will be no wells or septic. It would all be on city water and wastewater. At the present time, the departments are noting that there is capacity to serve the development. Finally, they included the standard phasing/expiration clause which would require this development to move forward within forty-eight months, or it would revert to the RE-1 zoning standards. Again, it would remain a PUD zoning, just that the standards would go to one acre per unit. This request was recommended for denial by a vote of four to one by the planning commission. They cited lot sizes, densities and wanting more open space. Logan Opsahl of Lowndes Law Firm was there to represent the case and answer any other questions.

Commissioner Pederson questioned if the existing PUD had expired. **PZD Miller** replied yes. It had

expired several years ago. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if we were still waiting to hear from the county. **PZD Miller** said that they normally send back the standard comments. However, staff did contact them today to see if there were any additional comments that they wanted to add. **CM Minner** added that since he had spoken with her, they had not heard back from the county.

Andrew McCown of GAI Consultants of 618 East South Street, Orlando, said he was there representing the Hanover Land Group. He brought a presentation, but it was almost identical to the one they saw at first reading. He did not want to go through everything again, but he was there to answer any questions. At the last meeting, the topics were about the spine road and traffic. Referring to a slide, he said the Spine Road would run through all five Banning phases from CR 48 to CR 33. As discussed last time, there were some potential concerns on a number of fronts regarding this spine road, such as potential speed since there were houses and neighborhoods that front and intersect with this road. Truck traffic was also brought up, so he would like to address each one of those items along with any other items that the commission would like to discuss. The Hanover Group obviously understands the concerns about the potential speed between the two county roads and although this would be an alternative route, they would not classify it as a cut through. The road is pretty circuitous and there will be stop signs and other types of traffic-calming measures implemented along this road. They can discuss the specifics about any of the traffic-calming methods that would be acceptable to staff and the commission as the project moves forward through the permitting process. However, it would be to keep the speeds down on the road because it is a two-lane road. It would not be designed to be a wide, fast road, so speeds would be kept to neighborhood level speeds along the entire course of the road. Along with any additional measures that would give the commission comfort in that regard. They are more than happy to discuss those. Obviously, there will be measures taken along that road to reduce speeds. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions or comments about the developer.

Commissioner Pederson mentioned that when he looked at this and other developments that are not even this large, he would call it a boulevard. He thought they were proposing a four-lane boulevard, but he just said two lanes. **Mr. McCown** replied that he believed it to be a two-lane road. **CM Minner** clarified that it would be designed to be a boulevard entry. They will have four lanes at CR 48 and CR 33 where they enter the subdivision and then those pinch down to two lanes. The boulevard entry is used for ingress and egress to get on and off CR 48 and CR 33. **Commissioner Pederson** added that he saw that in some prior developments where the four lanes extended often times through the entire development. When he looked at that road, he just assumed it was a four-lane road. **Commissioner Burry** commented that when looking at the picture in the PUD, it does imply that there are four lanes. It was on page twenty-two of the PUD in the packet. It makes it look like that, but it is just eight feet of entryways at CR 48 and CR 33. **Commissioner Pederson** remarked that he was not sure where to start because he hears comments from the public, and he hears them everywhere he goes, but when he looks at this development, if we have already done phases one through four, he hopes that phase five would help by taking pressure off of CR 33 and CR 470. This one is tough for him, but we have already done one through four, so he feels that they almost have to do five, and he did not take that comment lightly. **Mr. McCown** said there was one last item he wanted to bring up. Referring to the slide, he wanted to remind the commission that he brought this up at the previous hearing with regard to the minimum lot depth, because they were requesting that it be changed from the draft ordinance of one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and fifteen, along with the subsequent changes to the minimum lot sizes. That would be the depth and the overall lot size. He just wanted to get that back on the record. He would be happy to answer any questions. The full team was there if there were any other questions. **Mayor Reisman** opened public comments.

Bill Polk opposed the PUD application due to the lot sizes being fifty-foot and sixty-foot. They are requesting two hundred and ninety-four homes, so that will not allow space to put trees between the

homes. There will be one house on top of the next house with a two-lane road running between two county roads. It will not relieve any traffic between CR 48 and CR 33. If the speed is set at twenty-five or thirty-five along with stop signs all along that road, nobody will go down that road. CR 33 is already crammed, and during rush hour it runs all the way back to Austin Merritt Road. He wanted to know when the city plans to build decent subdivisions. Where he lives in Palmora Park there are two lots; one is fifty feet and the other is fifty-five feet and those houses are as wide as the lot. There is nothing between them. He would like the city to beautify Leesburg, but this is not beautifying it. He would like to see a decent subdivision put in here. Jack Banning used to own this property, so he knows there is swampland down in there. They will need to build a bridge going across the water somewhere. They will have environmental issues as well, because there are eagles, gophers, deer and turkeys. The developers should increase the size of the lots to make this look pretty. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other public comments. There were none. He closed public comments.

Mr. McCown said he wanted to respond to the comments. The notion that they cannot get a decent subdivision on fifty-foot lots was not true because some of the most desirable neighborhoods in the region are on fifty-foot lots and smaller to incorporate townhomes and all types of units. He would reference communities like Boldwin Park and Lake Nona to name a few examples. There are many examples of well landscaped, well-designed and well-implemented neighborhoods all over the region. They should not take fifty-foot lots as an indication of a poor-quality subdivision or poor-quality design.

Commissioner Connell said he felt like he had been beating a dead horse over the last five years, but he had been talking about traffic problems in this town for the last five years, and it continues to get worse because they continue to annex and rezone property. Again, this is on CR 33 and CR 48, which are two-lane roads and the intersection of CR 48, CR 33, and CR 470 is awful. There is a conceptual plan by the county that somewhat addresses it, but it will not do a lot because they will maybe add a couple of turn lanes. That would help, but we cannot keep annexing property on these roads that dumps the traffic on these two-lane roads. It is all being funneled back to the same intersection. It is awful and people are cutting through now off of CR 33 down Industrial. They are going down industrial to Haywood Worm Farm Road to hang a left back and that is becoming a major cut through. He did not believe they should annex any more property or, in this particular case, approve any more development on these roads until that intersection has been properly addressed and completed. We are creating a bigger problem every time we do this. He hoped the commission would take that into consideration when voting. We do not need any more traffic down there until the roads and that intersection are addressed. **Commissioner Pederson** said he respected Commissioner Connell's comments even though they have not been in agreement for years. He said earlier that they had a lot to talk about. However, he does view this one a little bit differently because we have already approved phases one through four. Yes, he was struggling, but that is what sways him on this one. He wanted to reiterate that he was open to any and all ideas because it is the talk of the town.

Commissioner Burry wanted to point out that this project is just like the Sunnyside project because this is an expired PUD, it is located within the City of Leesburg, so the property is already there. Our planning and zoning department has said this is what they can build, and it is within the comprehensive plan, and it will have the same result if we say no to it. We can expect the same thing to happen that happened with the Sunnyside property and that is just how it is. **Commissioner Pederson** thanked him for that clarification and to clarify that it was because the property was already located in the city limits. They did not have to annex it in. **Commissioner Burry** continued to say there was a neighborhood within Sunnyside that is not developed yet, but it was within the City of Leesburg that had an existing PUD to be built, but it was never built. That PUD expired, somebody else purchased that property, and it is the same scenario as this. They came to our planning and zoning people, worked within our comp plan, got the design, and they said no. So then they sued the city, and the special magistrate told us that we did

not have a case. He did not see any difference in this, and we would be wasting taxpayer money because we would be on the losing end of it. **Commissioner Berry** said it was unfortunate that we have done the various phases of Banning, and it is unfortunate that we have not heard back from the county as far as the roads, because they are not city roads. She wanted to know if it was possible to table this until they got further information. **Commissioner Pederson** commented that he wanted to piggyback off of Commissioner Burry's comment because the issue is, if we turn down an annexation, we are shielded because we have limited liability, but in this case, he is correct. We have the legal liability because it meets all our code. We learned a valuable lesson with Sunnyside, and he appreciates him bringing that up because this is a similar situation where it is already in the city and the case law did go against us on Sunnyside. We ended up settling that after fighting it for a year or two. **CA Watson** explained if a property owner demonstrates that they meet the code with their application, then it is on the city to bring up information and evidence that would rebut their ability to develop the property as it is done. Typically, that would be done through expert testimony and in this instance, the expert testimony would come from staff or the developers' side. However, the staff's recommendation was for approval because it meets the code and all the requirements. It would be more challenging to turn it down and Sunnyside was a good example to bring up because they all saw how that played out. Basically, they would need evidence to refute that this is a good plan that works within the code. In the absence of that evidence, then there would be a lack of competent substantial evidence to refute and rebut the developer's position.

Mayor Reisman thanked Commissioner Burry for bringing that up and for the city attorney clarifying that. He asked if the only thing they were waiting for from the county was just additional comments. **PZD Miller** answered that it was correct. **Mayor Reisman** wanted to confirm that they looked over everything, and we just asked them for additional comments. **PZD Miller** agreed. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that he would like the whole Banning project to be in a community development district (CDD) which the PUD indicated that they were willing to move in that direction because that would make the development itself more responsible for their roads.

Ben Snyder of Hanover Land Company, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Orlando, said yes, they were planning to put the entire Banning development, which includes all five phases, into a single CDD.

Commissioner Pederson said during the first reading, he learned something because he pushed back and asked if the developer could maintain the road, and he was told it was a city road. So, if there was a CDD would they maintain the roads? **PZD Miller** explained that a CDD comes under Florida Statute Chapter 190, and they can be written in a multitude of ways. If they want that road to be there, it could be. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that for his vote it would have to be in there. **Commissioner Pederson** said the reason he hesitated was because he would rather see that money spent on CR 33 and CR 48. That was why he hesitated, but he would let other commissioners chime in. **Commissioner Berry** wanted further clarification on whether it was necessary to have the road to go through because it is joining each phase to another phase. What is the purpose? Is it just to drive through? **Mr. Snyder** indicated that from a planning perspective, it is good to have the phases interconnected so that traffic can flow in both directions. From a utility perspective, it is good to have the trunk lines on CR 48 connected to CR 33 for looping. Then, from an infrastructure standpoint, it is objectively a better plan to create a subdivision that is interconnected with multiple county roads rather than one entrance. Otherwise, there would be dead-end subdivisions which are objectively bad planning. **Mr. McCown** added that the amenities for all phases are shared, and they are scattered throughout the entire development, and the residents are not precluded from using any of the amenities across all five phases. If there was a break in any of the lines, they would have to go all the way around to access the other amenities. **PZD Miller** remarked that the comprehensive plan requires the city to have interconnectivity between different subdivisions, and he could not find a way not to interconnect these subdivisions.

CM Minner explained going back to Commissioner Burry's comment. With the CDD requirement, he did not think they have ever put one of those into the PUD, and this PUD has some of the older language where dedication is left open. In the more recent PUDs, it clearly states that we will accept dedication of infrastructure. However, this one has the old language where it is open. It says that the city may accept; it is not a guarantee. If there was a requirement for a CDD, we should add an extra paragraph to the PUD to amend it and make it paragraph 16G, which would say something like the city commission will require the development of a CDD for development and future maintenance of infrastructure.

CA Watson agreed that they should add that, and they could easily add that language into the PUD.

Commissioner Burry made a motion to amend the PUD by adding paragraph 16G, to require the creation of a CDD to cover the development and future maintenance of PUD infrastructure for Banning Phases One through Five, and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

CM Minner reiterated that he was referencing back to Banning Phases One through Five.

Commissioner Burry indicated that they had that motion, but did they want to address changing from one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and fifteen? **CM Minner** stated his recommendation would be to leave it where it is. They would have bigger lots, and they are asking the commission to make smaller lots. The PUD that is being considered is paragraph 4E1d, which requires the minimum size be 6,250, and they are asking that the commission reduce the size. The draft ordinance is still that first bullet. It is 6,250 for fifty-foot lots and 7,500 for sixty-foot lots. They are asking to make that a tick smaller. If they were to oblige that request, they would need to amend it. However, if they do not want to oblige that request to keep the lots a bit larger, then approve the PUD as presented. **Commissioner Pederson** added that they want to take ten feet off the back of each lot. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any further comments on the amendment. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to confirm the motion on the floor was to amend the PUD. **Commissioner Burry** confirmed that the motion on the floor was to add paragraph 16G. It would require that the entire Banning development phases One through Five be in a CDD. **CM Minner** stated the motion on the floor is to add paragraph 16G, which requires that the PUD put together a CDD for Banning Phases One through Five to develop and maintain infrastructure in the future. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to confirm that they would be voting on that first before voting on the PUD. **CM Minner** agreed because it would be an amendment to the PUD. A yes vote on this does not mean they are approving the PUD. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there was any further discussion on the amended motion. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission approved the amendment.

Mayor Reisman indicated that they needed to go back to the original motion on the floor. **CM Minner** agreed, unless they wanted to consider changing the lot sizes.

Commissioner Burry wanted to know why they would need the lot changes. **PZD Miller** pointed out that staff is always trying to get the largest lots we can get, but the developers want smaller lots. That is respectfully the answer. **Commissioner Burry** asked the same question of the developer. Why the amendment, and why do they want to change that? **Mr. Snyder** said honestly, most of the lots are one hundred and twenty and one hundred and twenty-five anyway. They would like the flexibility to go to

one hundred and fifteen when working around wetlands. That way, they do not end up having to impact the wetlands or pay to mitigate them. It is really for a very limited number of lots where they are skirting around wetlands, so that we are not pushing lots in the wetlands. However, the majority of the lots will be designed as one hundred and twenty and one hundred and twenty-five anyway. They would appreciate the flexibility. **Commissioner Pederson** added if they are going to do it, maybe they could put a small number on it or just leave it like it is. **CM Minner** indicated that the staff recommendation is that they leave it like it is because that is a developer problem. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

- 2. 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 ANNEX)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-68

Commissioner Burry introduced ordinances 6.A.2, 6.A.3, and 6.A.4 to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinances by title only.

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

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller said this was the Legacy Commerce project. It consists of an annexation, small-scale comprehensive plan, and a rezoning of 7.3 plus or minus undeveloped acres. It is generally located on the west side of US 27 and north of University Avenue. This is for a commercial/industrial type development. There would be zero residential. It includes 50,200 square feet of multi-use/office/warehouse-type buildings. Under the overall proposal, there would be annexation and future land use which would go from Lake County Urban to City General Commercial. The zoning application would request to go from Lake County Agriculture to City of Leesburg Small Planned Unit Development. There were no public responses to the ads or letters and Lake County responded with a no comment. Under the terms of the SPUD agreement there would be 50,200 feet of multi-use office and warehouse buildings on the 7.3 acres. It includes offices, warehouses, mini warehouses, industrial flex

space, indoor light manufacturing, building trades and contractors with indoor storage such as electricians, plumbers, AC contractors and then, of course, a daycare and private school, as the location is near residential development. There are design standards including screening of mechanical equipment and the standard thirty-five percent open space, dark sky lighting, landscape plan, etc. Two floors is the maximum height and site access is shown on the site plan. The developer would be required to make any and all upgrades to US 27, which is more than likely to be a deceleration lane improvement. The utilities would be on city water and wastewater. There will be no wells or septic. It also has a four-year substantial commencement clause. Attorney, J.B. Bricklemyer is here to answer any questions.

Mayor Reisman asked if any of the residential property was fenced that borders the mobile home park? **PZD Miller** answered that, generally, when we have a residential to a commercial, city staff will require a fence in the PUD.

J. B. Bricklemyer of 17032 John Lake Drive, Winter Garden, apologized for his voice. He was just coming off surgery, so he was still a little weak still. He asked if the commission had any questions he could answer. There were none. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any public or commission comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

- 3. 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)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-69

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

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

The roll call vote was:

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

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

4. **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)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-70

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

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

The roll call vote was:

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

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

5. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, Amending Chapter 25 of the Code of Ordinances to create Section 25-165 establishing procedures for requests for reasonable accommodation for Certified Recovery Residences and Other Persons with Disabilities; providing for purpose, application, review, appeal, and enforcement procedures; providing for annual recertification; providing for inclusion in the Code of Ordinances; providing for conflicts; providing for severability; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-73

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

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

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

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Burry	Yes

Mayor Reisman Yes

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

B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES:

- 1. 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 18.71 +/- acres from City of Leesburg Low Density Residential and General Commercial to City of Leesburg General Commercial, for a property generally located west of U.S. Highway 27 and north of Palm Drive, lying in Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Dominium Apartments SSCP)**

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

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

Mayor Reisman stated for clarification that this is the first reading and these items will lay over till January 12, 2026.

PZD Miller explained that this was the Dominium Apartment project. Again, a small scale comprehensive plan and rezoning for the 18.71 acres. It is located on the west side of US 27, north of Palm Drive and Armoyan Boulevard and south of CR 25A. The proposal is for the future development of an apartment complex consisting of two hundred and seventy-six multifamily units. The future land use request would go from General Commercial and Low Density to General Commercial. The zoning application is a request to change from PUD to PUD with revised conditions. There were no substantive comments from the city departments. The school board noted that the applicant will be required to obtain a school concurrency reservation in order to reserve capacity and if, at the time of development, adequate capacity is not available, they would be subject to a mitigation agreement. Lake County Public Works did not have any comments on this project. We received a couple of written responses to the ads and letters. The concerns included significant alteration of the character of the neighborhood, increased traffic, noise and light pollution, and increased crime. There were concerns about stormwater runoff, and additional noise, loose pets and children walking around. Under the terms of the SPUD agreement, the proposal again was for two hundred and seventy-six multifamily units on 18.71 acres. It would include two, three, and four-bedroom units provided in eight hundred, nine hundred, and one thousand square foot apartment sizes. The project proposal does include design standards. There will be twenty-five-foot undisturbed buffers all the way around. There is a four-foot-tall earthen berm along US 27 and CR 25A, which is supplemented with plantings on the top to provide visual and noise buffers. Opaque fencing is required where the property is adjacent to residential areas. We also have the requirement for thirty-five percent of open space, dark sky lighting, code-compliant landscaping and Bahia or Bermuda grass. The maximum height size for the buildings is three floors. There are facade samples of the proposal included in the packet. There is access shown on the site plan which includes one primary access point and one emergency access point on the south and east sides of the project. The PUD requires the developer to provide all necessary upgrades to the roadways as required by FDOT or Lake County. As required, 1.3 acres must be recreational land, which may include a swimming pool, children's playground, and a dog park. All utilities will be on city water and wastewater, there will be no wells and septic. There is the

phasing and expiration clause. There are a couple of different site plans that they may wish to talk about that would impact the parking ratios. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the planning and zoning director.

Commissioner Connell wanted to know what the original PUD was approved for. **PZD Miller** replied that originally the property had two PUDs on it. One was for assisted living, which included two hundred and fifty beds plus some commercials on the east side. The assisted living was on the west side of the property, and there were two separate PUDs that came in around 2006 or 2008. Again, it had some commercial development on the east portion of the property proposed and then two hundred and fifty beds of assisted living on the western portion of the property. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to verify that there were no residential facilities approved as part of the original PUD. **PZD Miller** agreed. **Commissioner Burry** mentioned that it was said there would be two exits, but one is for emergencies only. **PZD Miller** said that was correct. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to know if they were expecting to have all the traffic from this to dump on to CR 25A. **PZD Miller** responded that it would come out on CR 25A to US 27. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to know about the residents who would want to go north. **PZD Miller** indicated that he believed they would be able to pull out on CR 25A to go north. **Commissioner Burry** said he thought if they were moving south on CR 25A that there was no way to get north because they would have to go north on CR 25A.

Logan Opsahl of 215 North Yola Drive said he would briefly review the project and the specifics that they have. Briefly, Dominion is the proposed applicant/developer. He introduced Glenn Daniels of Dominion, who would give a brief overview of who they are and what they do.

Glenn Daniels of Dominion, 375 Northridge Road, Suite 500, Sandy Springs, Georgia, said he was there representing Dominion. Dominion is one of the largest owners, operators, and developers of attainable housing in the nation. They have been in the business for fifty years and, in Florida alone, they have been working, owning, and operating over thirty-three apartment communities for over a decade. He wanted to introduce their company since this was the first time they would be working with the City of Leesburg. They want to be partners working through the PUD that is proposed. In Florida alone, they have over seventy-five hundred apartment homes housing over fourteen hundred residents. He stressed that they want to partner with the City of Leesburg. They understand the city wants to maintain compatibility and neighborhood compatibility, which they are here for. They are not a developer that builds, sells, and leaves. They come and stay. They own and operate their properties for at least fifteen years. He was looking forward to the partnership with the City of Leesburg.

Mr. Opsahl continued to say with project specifics this would include about eighteen acres. It was previously annexed in 2011. They referenced some of the previous entitlements which he would discuss. Referring to the slides, he said they were there for the PUD. He referred to some renderings to show what was being proposed. This would be a fully amenitized residential community. They are really Class A amenities. The benefit of having these types of uses is, quite frankly, we know that across the state, specifically central Florida, there is an affordability and housing crisis. So, having a company like Dominion come in and partner with the city to provide this type of development that is fully amenitized, they see as an asset across the central Florida region. He showed a conceptual rendering of the community, and they could also search to see that they are similarly situated because there are several built across the state. This is a competitive market because folks have limitations regarding income and rent. These folks are school teachers, firefighters, and police officers who will move into these communities and stay. There will be four bedrooms, three bedrooms, and two bedrooms. Just to provide an idea of the rent; four bedrooms would be \$1,834, three bedrooms would be \$1,644, and two bedrooms would be \$1,423.

With the history of the property, it was previously approved as a commercial and office park component as well as a three hundred and five assisted living residence. Those were the two uses of the property that are expired PUD ordinances. The City of Leesburg zoning map shows that it was annexed back in 2011 under the PUD with a split future land use for general commercial. So, comparing the two, that would equate to the highway-commercial underlying zoning uses. There are some institutional, like government facilities, a school and church, there are some utilities, but they also have what was previously approved as an adult daycare facility. There is group living/multifamily allowable use, hotel/motel, and vehicle sales. Those are the types of uses underlying the future land use and then the commercial front. He showed language that was from the city code and for this SPUD there is an infill area that requires an innovative site plan and a flexible approach to the buildout. Referring to the slide, he showed what the property looks like today. There are some structures out there that are pretty dilapidated in their condition. There are some storage and dumping ground areas, which is not ideal. He then showed the conceptual plan which was taken from the planned development ordinance itself, and it was included as part of the packet.

What he wanted to present as part of their request was a change to the parking. The city code requires two parking spaces per unit and several jurisdictions throughout have different parameters as it relates to these types of developments, and they have provided in the application package a study which was done by Kimley-Horn. That study demonstrates that these types of developments simply require less parking. They do not want to see an overparked, unnecessary imperious area on this property. They asked their engineers to put together a site plan that was beyond the conceptual that they needed to do to meet sufficiency in an application package. They asked them to build a community that met the parking requirements, and he showed a rendering of what they were able to do. They had their community meeting and some of the feedback that they received was that this was a wooded area. They also heard about the berm and the existing vegetation. They are trying to install this community in such a way that it will be tucked back and not really visible from US 27. Utilizing the study that was provided by their engineer as well as real-world buildouts, they have these communities elsewhere, so they have seen the parking and they have the data. They know the practicality of who is parking there and how much is required. Their request as part of this PUD approval is for 1.6 parking spaces per unit as opposed to the code requirement of two. Two parking spaces were included in the staff reports, but they were proposing a 1.6 so that they could accommodate the specific requests that were received from their community meeting. He showed a rendering of what meets the code requirement of two parking spaces and said that there would be five hundred and fifty-five parking spaces. Again, it would meet all the performance standards in the PUD ordinance, but the changes they would see are to the east and south where the existing residential developments are and that would be about thirty-nine feet and thirty feet as shown. What they are proposing meets their studies, and they have seen in other communities, is four hundred and forty-two spaces. It does meet 1.6 spaces per unit and what it does is pretty striking because it allows them to increase the setbacks to one hundred and forty plus on the east side, one hundred and twenty-nine plus on the south side, and one hundred and forty-one plus on the north side. It allows them to have less imperious areas. They do not want to unnecessarily over park this development because it would look like some of the shopping malls that they see around town. It would allow for more green space, buffering and setbacks from the existing developments, which ultimately provides for additional compatibility. He brought the traffic engineer along with other representatives from the project team to answer any questions.

In closing, it is powerful to note a few things and one is the limitations as it relates to income levels, the folks who would move into these communities because they are highly competitive. In order to apply to live in a Dominion community, they have to go through a background check, and they have to be a citizen. They do a full review of income levels because they want to know who is moving in. For two people, it is \$56,400, for three people, it is \$56,940, for four people, it is \$63,240. He just pulled that

from their website, but there may be some additional detail that goes into this. However, a Leesburg police officer's base salary starts at \$62,000, the firefighters are \$53,000, and Lake County schools start at \$49,500. These are the folks who would live and work here, so they will be catering to a highly competitive market. That is important because they need to think about those real-world practicalities. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the developers.

Commissioner Burry said he would like a list of the developments in Florida that Dominion owns before second reading. **Commissioner Pederson** asked from a city staff standpoint which parking plan they would support. **PZD Miller** answered that the data shows they could work it with 1.6. The issue staff has is looking at the two site plans, that one is clearly superior to the other one in terms of buffering and the use of the land. The emergency access and access points pretty much stay the same, but in terms of buffers for the neighbors, that is a big deal to staff, and they have worked very hard with staff to come up with something good. City staff are willing to bend on the parking in order to create something like this. It is a tough call, and he respects whatever the commission decides on. **Commissioner Pederson** said earlier he heard a comment that the ingress egress was off CR 25A and to him, it looks like it is off US 27. **Mr. Opsahl** commented that was what the planning and zoning director referred to as emergency access. They have met with FDOT, and they are proposing full access to both to allow for better sight circulation. **Commissioner Pederson** inquired if they would have a median cut there. **Mr. Opsahl** replied that there was a median cut there already. However, all of that would have to go through FDOT. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any further comments by the commission. There were none. He opened public comments.

Bill Polk of 600 Cascade Avenue wanted to know where exactly this was located. Is CR 25A south of the shopping center? **Mayor Reisman** said it was out there by the Lake Dunham Estates. **Mr. Polk** stated there would be between four hundred and fifty to four hundred and eighty cars trying to get in and out of there and that is just crazy. How are they going to get on the highway? They cannot get out CR 25A unless they go south to where the trailer park is down there. There is a median cut there, but it is not wide or long enough for a car. Are they going to put a stoplight there even though there is another one not far from there at the Southside Shopping Center? There is no way to get four hundred and eighty cars out of there a day because it is backed up all the way south of CR 48. They are talking about the old Lucan's property right off of CR 25A, right? **Commissioner Burry** agreed. **Commissioner Pederson** said he believed the entrance matched up to English Road. **Commissioner Burry** pointed to the slide that showed where the entrance would be. **Mr. Polk** continued to say that was the south end of CR 25A. So they would go south on CR 25A to come out. **Mr. Opsahl** pointed out that they have to work with FDOT on the signalization warrant study and all that. They have done a driveway permit study, and they met with FDOT on that, so they will be looking at those things.

Trey Holiday of 905 North Shore Drive, wanted to confirm if the two, three, four bedrooms had a maximum square footage of a thousand square feet. **PZD Miller** stated that was the minimum square footage. **Mr. Holiday** asked if this was government-subsidized housing? **Mr. Opsahl** answered that it was not subsidized housing. **Mr. Holiday** said that, basically, they are putting in government housing. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other public comments. There were none. He closed public comments.

Mr. Opsahl said he appreciated the comments and feedback, but this will not be government housing. There are certain tax incentives that give Dominion the fifteen-year outlook that they have and that they build successful communities in. They want to see a successful community because they are going to own it and operate it, and that is what they have seen. That is why we have such demand for these types of communities, and he outlined the types of folks that they would see living here. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any final comments from the commission.

Commissioner Pederson said he likes the project, but he was concerned about the ingress/egress and the traffic. So, anything they can do to mitigate that would be good. Also, he was on a committee with the Chamber years ago. It was an education committee, and they met with all the principals at the schools, and they talked about their frustration about there not being any housing for the teachers. They would tell him that they would hire a teacher that lived in Clermont, Eustis, and Mount Dora, and as soon as a position came open in those areas, the teachers were gone. They were advocating for this type of housing. So the project is great, but he was concerned about the traffic and the ingress/egress. He knows the city does not have authority on a light, but those were his only concerns. **Mr. Opsahl** said that with this being the first reading, they will have a traffic study and there are traffic engineers that they are working with. They have met with FDOT, and they will continue to provide that information to the city, particularly at second reading. **Commissioner Connell** said he had a couple of things he would like the commission to think about. We are talking about ten three-story apartment buildings and at the last meeting the commission approved three and four-story apartment buildings. How many more apartment buildings do we need? Do we need ten three-story apartment buildings at this location? For him that is way too much. Based on the number of units and the acreage, it comes out to about fifteen units per acre, which is a pretty high density. The ingress and egress to get out of this location is awful. They are going to have apartments, and some of them will be three bedrooms and some will be four bedrooms, so are we really going to let them get away with 1.6 spaces? How many people realistically rent a three-bedroom or a four-bedroom apartment with less than two vehicles? A lot of them will have three vehicles for a four-bedroom apartment. Even remotely considering letting reduce the parking from 2 to 1.6 is craziness. This is an expired PUD. It was approved for assisted living. It was never approved for apartments. In his opinion, they have no type of vesting to come back and get ten three-story apartments with additional traffic. These are some things he hoped the commission will consider when this comes back for a second reading. These are issues, and to say the buildings will not be visible from US 27? How are they going to hide ten three-story buildings? **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any further comments. There were none. He stated this item would lay over until January 12th.

2. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 18.71 +/- acres from City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow for 276 multifamily units for a property generally located west of U.S. Highway 27 and north of Palm Drive, lying in Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Dominium Apartments PUD)**

C. **NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:**

1. **None**

7. **INFORMATIONAL REPORTS:**

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

- A. **Financial Reports as of September 2025**

Mayor Reisman asked if anyone had questions relating to the financial reports. **Commissioner Pederson** said he always goes through these reports, but one thing jumped out at him. He saw that the collection amounts said it was for security. Do we need to have these people pay up front or do we need to have a bigger security deposit, because he was surprised that the city had to hire attorneys to collect on these? **CM Minner** answered that he would dig into this and get back with him.

8. CITY ATTORNEY ITEMS:

CA Watson had no reports to address.

9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

CM Minner had no item to comment on.

10. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Connell had no further comment.

Commissioner Burry had nothing to comment on.

Commissioner Pederson congratulated Mayor Reisman on receiving the Greg Padgett award at the Leesburg Chamber. Greg was a personal friend of his. He was a great community advocate, so to receive that award is quite an honor.

Commissioner Berry stated Commissioner Pederson stole her thunder. She then congratulated Sandi Moore and Chevon along with all the new members of the chamber. She had a great night on Thursday, and hoped more businesses would continue to join.

Mayor Reisman wanted to point out multiple grand openings this week. They have Wawa, and another one that is behind the Town Place suites along with the Wastewater Treatment Plant grand opening. Discover Leesburg is on the 12th. If anyone wants to come out to the Lone Oak Cemetery, they will have their Wreaths across America on the 13th, and he will be the MC for that event. In closing, he hoped to see everyone at the Chamber Sunrise Breakfast sponsored by the City of Leesburg on December 18th at 7 a.m. **CC Purvis** informed the commission that their next meeting is Monday the 15th due to the holidays.

11. ADJOURN:

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

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

With a motion by Commissioner Pederson and a second by Commissioner Burry, the meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.