

**AGENDA MINUTES
CITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET
MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2026 5:30 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, January 12, 2026, at Leesburg City Hall. Mayor Berry called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present:

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

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

INVOCATION

The invocation and pledge of allegiance were conducted at the Carver Heights/Montclair Area Community Redevelopment Agency meeting held just prior.

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

2. PROCLAMATIONS:

A. None

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!

A few members of the P.E.O. (Philanthropic Educational Organization) Sisterhood Chapter of Leesburg came out to congratulate Allyson Berry on her appointment as Mayor for 2026. They presented her with a bouquet of flowers as they believe she will represent the city well. They were very proud of her.

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 Reisman seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Mayor Berry	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 December 15, 2025**
- 2. Organizational Meeting held January 5, 2026**

B. PURCHASING ITEMS:

- 1. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Professional Engineering Consulting Services Agreement with the following firms: Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc., Halff Associates, Inc., GAI Consultants, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., CHA Consulting, Inc., Dewberry Engineers, Inc., Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. and CPH Consulting, LLC, for professional engineering consulting services on a continuing basis; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12, 176

- 2. Purchase request by the Electric Department for the upgrade to its existing Quad Redundant System SCADA Master Stations by QEI, LLC in the**

amount of \$127,544.00 using an existing agreement between the City and QEI, LLC.

3. **Purchase request to approve the renewal of a one (1) year software maintenance in the amount of \$93,000.00 from Bluewater Systems, Inc. dba Perconti.**
4. **Purchase request by the Electric Department for inspection and treatment services of electric utility wood poles for Fiscal Year 2026 by Osrose Utilities Services, Inc. in the amount of \$115,000.00.**

C. RESOLUTIONS:

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, amending the Fiscal Year 2024-25 Budget for the General, Stormwater, Debt Service, Capital Projects, Electric, Gas, Water, Wastewater, Solid Waste, Airport, Health Insurance, Workers Compensation, Building Permits, and Fleet Services Funds for the Fourth Quarter; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12, 177

2. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement affecting the property described therein from Darrell Brenton Sellars and Ashley N. Sellars, joined by Citizens First Bank; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12, 178

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 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)

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 26-01

Mayor Berry asked the city attorney to perform the swearing-in. **CA Watson** asked for anybody wishing to speak on Agenda Item 6.A.2 (Dominion PUD) and Agenda Item 6.A.3 (Leesburg Flex) to stand and raise their right hand. He swore them all in.

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

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

Mayor Berry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated this item was for the Dominion Apartments. The project consists of a small-scale comprehensive plan amendment and a rezoning. There is no annexation involved with this request because the property is already located within the city limits. The site consists of 18.71 plus or minus acres. It is generally located on the west side of U.S. Highway 27, north of Palm Avenue. The request is for approval of a future development which consists of two hundred and seventy-six multifamily dwelling units. Under this request, the future land use application is requesting a change from general commercial and low density to general commercial. The zoning application for the project is requesting a change from PUD to PUD with revised conditions. The property is currently zoned under two expired PUDs. The first being Ordinance 13-39, which was for a three-hundred and six-bed assisted living facility, and the second being Ordinance 11-95, which was for a commercial office park. The application was sent to all city departments and there were no substantive comments received from the city departments. The school board issued a public facilities determination letter and the applicant will need to obtain a school concurrency reservation or a mitigation agreement prior to development. Lake County Public Works did not have any comments on the project. The applicant and Lake County have met, and they are working together on any roadway improvements. FDOT is requiring full access to the southern portion of the property, so there will be two full access points. He noted that in public responses, a summary of those responses included concerns about significant alteration of the character of the neighborhood, increased traffic noise and light pollution, increased crime, concerns about stormwater runoff, additional noise, loose pets, and children walking around the area. He understands that there were neighbors present who wished to comment. Under the terms of the PUD agreement, this proposal consists of two hundred and seventy-six multifamily units. No other uses are permitted. The maximum building height shown is three floors. There will be two-, three-, and four-bedroom units provided with eight hundred, nine hundred, and one thousand square foot unit sizes for each of those respectively. The current site plan meets the requirements for the parking code. However, the applicant did show at first reading a different site plan with much larger buffers on it. They are asking for that, and it would reduce the parking sum somewhat. There are twenty feet of undisturbed buffers around the project, a four-foot-tall earth and berm along U.S. Highway 25, supplemented with plantings along top of the berm to provide a visual and noise buffer. There is a requirement for opaque fencing where the property is adjacent to residential areas. A minimum 35% of the property must be an open space. Dark sky lighting is required. There is a code-compliant landscaping plan required. Bahia and Bermuda grass are permitted, but no St. Augustine due to its water consumption. Under site access, there is the primary access point and a second which is on the southern part of the property. The PUD will require the developer to provide any and all expansions or upgrades to the access points and roadways as needed and required by

FDOT and Lake County. Under recreation, 1.3 acres of the property has to be parkland and that would include one primary recreation area with three amenities. That would be a swimming pool, a children's playground, and a dog park. The project will be on the city of Leesburg utilities for water and wastewater. There will be no wells or septic on the property. Finally, there is a phasing or expiration clause which requires the development to move forward within forty-eight months with substantial commencement, or it would automatically revert to the RE-1 zoning code, which is one acre per unit. This is designated as an attainable workforce housing project to meet the needs of affordable housing, which is a market need within the city. The planning commission did recommend denial by a vote of two to four, citing left turn traffic, and parking concerns. Logan Opsahl of Lowndes Law Firm was present to answer any questions. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any questions for the planning and zoning director.

Commissioner Connell wanted to know when the two PUDs expired. **PZD Miller** responded that the older PUDs expired in 2011 and 2013. **Commissioner Connell** affirmed that they were both expired, but he guessed he would say that was prior to the stipulation that the property would revert to one unit per acre. **PZD Miller** agreed. **Commissioner Connell** stated that if this were a newer PUD it would have gone to one unit per acre. **PZD Miller** said that was correct. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know when that stipulation went into effect. **PZD Miller** replied about a year ago.

Commissioner Burry questioned if the property had two different zonings currently on it. **PZD Miller** replied that was correct. The property on the west was the three hundred and six unit assisted living and the office park was out towards the east on US 27. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to confirm that it was low-density residential and general commercial. **PZD Miller** pointed out that the three-hundred and six-bed assisted living was more like an apartment complex.

Mayor Berry asked if parking was a concern when this was discussed during the first reading. **PZD Miller** replied that the current proposed site plan meets the parking code. However, the one that they would like it to be changed to would reduce the parking. However, it also greatly increases the buffers. To be quite frank, city staff does prefer the one that gives the greater buffers to the neighbors, it would be the newer one that they would like to have put into the PUD. **Commissioner Pederson** asked about the difference in buffering. **PZD Miller** answered that it is over one hundred feet. It does have pretty large buffers on the newer option, and there may be an example of that in the packet. **Commissioner Pederson** wanted to know if the developer was flexible with either plan. **PZD Miller** explained that the applicants would prefer the second plan, and they would like to have that changed out and put into the new PUD.

Commissioner Pederson stated, for the record, parking was more important to him than the buffers. The buffers would still be adequate, and he does want them adequate, but it would be closer to twenty-five feet, which is typically what we do. He believed he mentioned a berm, and where he was going with it, was that parking is important to him, and he believed it goes to two. **PZD Miller** agreed the rate would be right around 2.0, which is the requirement. **Commissioner Pederson** said he would have no problem with that. However, the 1.6 does tug at him. **PZD Miller** indicated that the applicant does have a presentation, and he was sure he would cover that. **Commissioner Reisman** added that they also own other properties which have 1.6 spaces for parking. **PZD Miller** agreed. They have one location in Orlando and other different locations throughout Central Florida. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any other questions for the planning and zoning director. There were none.

Logan Opsahl of Lowndes Law, 215 North Yola Drive, Orlando, said they did not have an updated PowerPoint presentation. However, he did bring in some handouts for the commission to view. There were some questions about other similar projects they owned, so he thought it would be beneficial for them to provide some renderings. The site plan included in the presentation was their preferred site plan,

but the handouts were a little easier for them to see and hold. It included the statistical data that was provided at first reading, which related to some of the top employers in Leesburg and Lake County. It also showed some examples of what the salaries were. They include city of Leesburg government jobs, firefighters, police officers, and Lake County schools. A parking analysis was done by their engineer, Kimley-Horn, which illustrated what they have utilized in other jurisdictions, and that does show that they utilized 1.6 and even less than that in certain jurisdictions. It uses data to show what this particular use yields in terms of parking usage, which allows those increased setbacks and less impervious areas and things along those lines and a transportation analysis. Before diving into the presentation, he noted that the planning and zoning director mentioned the two future land use designations on the property. Under the permitted uses within the city, they wanted to spell out with their engineer what the differences and trips looked like and what would exist under the existing entitlements. Again, some of this presentation will be a review, but he wanted to make sure they touched on these items and to answer any specific questions. Before getting into the presentation, he wanted to call up a member of their project team, Glenn Daniels, to remind the commission a little bit about Dominion and what they do.

Glenn Daniels of 375 Northridge Road, Sandy Springs, Georgia, said he was there on behalf of the developer, Dominion. Dominion is one of the largest attainable housing developers in the nation. They have been in the state of Florida for over a decade. They own and manage over thirty-three apartment communities with over seven thousand five hundred residents in their apartment communities. Before getting into the land use discussion tonight, he wanted to call out that Dominion was not a developer that builds and leaves. They are looking for a partnership with the city of Leesburg, hence all the work they have done to get this PUD signed. With that, they would own and manage the property for at least fifteen years. The property will be attainable housing for at least thirty years, and they were grateful for the opportunity to partner with the city of Leesburg, and they look forward to the commissions' consideration.

Continuing, **Mr. Opsahl** said (referring to his handouts) some of the items were provided by the property appraiser's website. There were a few parcels out there and moving to the next slide they would see how the future land use designation exists today, and it does overlay these parcels. The planning and zoning director did outline the request, and it is to make a consistent future land use across the totality of the assemblage for general commercial and then the PUD would allow for their use. Throughout this presentation, what has been handed to the commission are pictures of what has been implemented elsewhere, and it does provide a good sense of this fully amenitized "class a" multifamily space for the residents. He showed some conceptual renderings, which were included at the first reading. It also yielded conversation to make sure that they provide real-world images. They historically touched on the property, and it has been approved for a commercial and office park as well as an assisted living facility for three hundred and six residents. That information was taken from expired PUDs as mentioned by the planning and zoning director, which is why they have a request to go from PUD to PUD. This property is already located within the city, and it shows the PUD which was just outlined. He provided a slide that shows the existing future land use map and the split. Much of this property is general commercial, but they were looking to bring in the remainder that way there was a consistent future land use designation across the entire property. Under the C-3, general commercial/highway commercial designations, some of the allowable include multifamily and group living. There are some more institutional uses, such as elementary, middle, high schools, churches, animal hospitals, hotels and motels and vehicular sales. The purpose of the PUD is for the purpose of the planned unit development request an innovative site plan design allows for things like the setbacks and items that they are putting forward in this preferred site plan. Allowing for proper development in these infill areas where the property is. Then creating some flexible approaches to achieve that, which is part of the conditions and part of the considerations in the PUD ordinance and the presentation. He showed a rendering of what the property looked like today. It showed a different kind of attainable housing, but it was not in ideal conditions. However, there were a

number of dilapidated structures and some areas that are just plain unlivable. There are other abandoned structures and barns located on the property. The proposed site plan and the printout were included in their handouts. It allows for a lot of buffering and additional setbacks. They did have a community meeting which was well attended and there were a variety of specifics that were brought up. A lot of which was maintaining the existing trees, particularly along the tree line, to allow for as much setback as possible. It also allows for 1.6 parking stalls per unit. Again, there were studies and real-life examples of this working so they can avoid additional impervious surface areas and allow for additional ponds and landscaping. One of the specific requests that came out of the community meeting was the idea of fencing or not. They worked into the PUD ordinance the ability to maintain that natural vegetation and those trees. That was a specific ask that they heard, so rather than ripping those trees out to put up a fence, it allows them the flexibility to work with staff to identify the appropriate areas to preserve the natural vegetation and other areas for installing a fence. Again, this shows a 1.6 ratio, it includes four hundred and forty-two parking spaces, and it has really worked from our expert reports to what has been built out and works very well in practicality.

As Glenn noted, Dominion goes on to own and operate these projects, and they want them to succeed. They can see the level of quality that the end product has and parking, of course, is a major consideration for these projects. They have a vested interest in making sure that this project has proper parking and setbacks are provided. On the east side there is over one hundred and forty feet. In the south there is over one hundred and twenty-nine feet. The north side is one hundred and forty-one feet from the building envelope, which are pretty significant setbacks. A lot of that vegetation is located along US 27, and it will also include a berm and additional plantings. They had their engineers go ahead and put together a concept plan which met the code and organized it in a way that they could maintain as much of the green areas, but also allow the buildings to be placed in an appropriate way that meets the PUD minimum required setbacks. It is typical of what they see in a lot of overparked projects. It is what they call the shopping mall effect because you really only see parked cars around Christmas and then other times they look at a lot of concrete. They took particular care and attention to having their engineers map out and plan a project that could be better organized, allow for more open space, less impervious areas and additional setbacks. Not only is it more attractive, not only is it better for runoff and maintaining drainage and storm water, but it also has the ability to meet specific comments that they heard during the community meeting.

Referring to a slide, he said the bottom left illustrates where the setbacks on the preferred site plan revert to following getting up to the two parking spaces rather than the 1.6 parking spots per unit. With that, he was happy to answer any questions because their whole project team was there. However, before concluding, he noted that they put great care into how this project was designed. The residents are the ones that will ultimately utilize them. They do see a lot of school teachers and government staff, a lot of the folks that they see in the sectors that are some of the more major employers in the area. These are folks that utilize this great, highly amenitized project. A lot goes into the choice of those residents as well, because there are income caps to make it attainable and income minimums. So, how do we verify that? It is a pretty extensive verification of employment because they have to verify that income structure. There are background checks that include criminal history, and again, proof of employment. There will be a lot of young families and folks who are just getting started. This is a well-thought-out, beautiful project that can be brought in to allow housing and amenities for these families. He always likes to end with a practical touch as they end the discussions in the land-use world, but he would like to reserve some time to respond to questions and specific comments.

Commissioner Pederson pointed out that he was the difficult one when it comes to parking, and he did not want to overly complicate it. However, he wanted to throw out an idea because he respects the neighbors who want more buffering. He understands if it is affordable housing, and he respects this

company because they own thirty-some projects, but his concern is twenty years from now when the bonds expire and there are no restrictions on the property. He did not think it could go to market-rent, but he thought the parking lot needed to be closer to 1.8 or 2 for the market-rent apartments. He wants to keep the neighbors happy, but he would be willing to compromise on the buffering and improve the parking. For example, 1.8, but he did not want to dictate what the parking lot is. He just wanted to throw that out to make a point that parking is important even though he does have concerns. He has been fairly consistent on a lot of projects when it comes to parking, but he feels a little out of line because he does respect the developer who has all these projects. He saw the list and the average was like 1.5 and here we are at 1.6. However, he was pushing back a little bit. He was curious how the other commissioners felt about it. He would love to see the buffer cut in half and parking improved. **Mr. Opsahl** replied that he had been consistent for sure, and they wanted to make sure that they had the information that included real world studies and real world buildouts that showed some of those parking ratios. Again, they usually land around 1.5, but they are requesting 1.6. Now, what that means in terms of total spaces from five hundred and fifty on the total buildout to four hundred and forty-two, is that they are not talking about a lot of spaces, but they are talking about a lot of benefits by removing the impervious areas.

Commissioner Pederson mentioned that he liked his comment about it being a shopping center parking lot, because he does not want a big asphalt parking lot out there empty. However, he does have concerns. He then asked if we had a different parking requirement on the market-rent apartments or is it the same?

PZD Miller replied it was the same. **Mayor Berry** asked for public comments.

The following public participants stated concerns regarding location, roads, insufficient ingress/egress, increased traffic, challenges of getting in and out of developments along US-27 and CR 25A, especially during rush hour, the number of proposed apartment homes, additional utilities and the demand for utilities. Along with this being located right next to a fifty-five year and older development, the development has too high of a density and could result in decreased property values.

Gerald Emerald of 337 Kuru Avenue, Lake Denham Estates	Cammy Johnson of 180 Duchess Drive, Corley Island Mobile Manor
Bill Polk of 600 Cascade Avenue, Leesburg	Valerie Kacinskis of 3739 Caspian Street, Lake Denham Estates
Carol Kropp of 1621 Chase Landing Way, Winter Park (Representative for the owners of the Corley Island Mobile Home Park residents)	Roland Nunez of 1928 CR 25A, Leesburg
Brian Matthew of 410 Perkins Street, Leesburg	

Mayor Berry asked if there were any further public comments. There were none. She asked the developer for his rebuttal.

Mr. Opsahl said they talked a lot about the existing future land use and this is something with existing entitlements and with the existing entitlements comes certain permitted uses. They have provided studies and traffic counts for what could go in there, particularly in commercial space. That would include significantly more traffic trips compared to what they were proposing. Yes, US 27 is a state road and everyone made excellent points, but they are working closely with FDOT. They have already met with them twice, and they want them to have two access points, and they are already looking at things. They also require a traffic warrant study and traffic signalization on the southern portion. So, that will be something that they have to look into and would ultimately have to pay for. With these types of projects, when there are traffic issues during the natural course of the process, they have to work with the

department that is responsible for the roads and, often times, the last to come in is not always the greatest thing, because they are the ones paying for the road improvements. These are traffic studies and the yield of peak hour trips versus what could be permitted in these future land use areas is a net reduction. With vehicles, he understands some folks at Lake Denham with excessive vehicles, but they will own and operate this development themselves. They also have a management company and part of the requirements is that they look at their future tenants, and they require vehicle registration. Upfront, they will know which vehicles are coming in, and they definitely would not allow six vehicles. That is another way in which they look at things on the parking ratio. This conceptual plan illustrates the trees, but what they miss in the aerial is that on the western side there is wetland, and there is a creek that runs through there, so there is some natural separation and topography to keep the properties and the project separate. It also allows for additional setbacks. There was a reason why they put the pond where they did was to make sure they were accounting for overflow in the event of storm events and things like that. Also, on the west side, he was the one who typed in "east at 140 feet", and it should have said "west at 140 feet" in the illustration. The east would not be included because it runs along US 27. They already have exceeding setbacks there from the PUD minimums, and they also have a landscaped four-foot berm above grade with additional plantings with natural vegetation. The previous zoning was for assisted living, which may have had less parking, but that was a previously approved PUD as it relates to a permissive use in the zoning. What he outlined was, under the future land use designations, there are a lot more uses that could come in which would yield a lot more trips compared to what they are proposing. A final point about the setbacks with what they are able to achieve is that, yes, it is for the residents, but it is also for their future residents, so they want to create the best product in the area, and they will be maintaining the additional setbacks. These will be three-story apartments, so they will not look down into other developments. Plus, they have additional setbacks and natural vegetation as it relates to the wetland area and existing tree line. Lastly, he believes they are able to address everything because he has been working with the project team. Yes, PUDs are negotiated zoning districts, so they have worked hard with staff to get through the PUD process to provide conditions that work well not just for the cities, but they went back and after the community meetings created more conditions to address the specifics they heard then and tonight. In the spirit of that cooperation and in good faith, they would be amenable to increase the parking from 1.6 to 1.8 while maintaining the setbacks. With that, he would be happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Reisman asked if he would clarify the fencing and the berms. **Mr. Opsahl** answered that the berms run along US 27, which is the four-foot earth and berm. There would be a preservation of the natural vegetation with the minimum landscaping requirements that would go in. As it relates to the fencing and the wall, they would have to put footers which would have to go along the property line, so they would lose a lot of trees and vegetation. More particularly on the south and southwest sides, where they do have pretty big mature trees. The PUD that was presented does give them the flexibility to work with staff, particularly on-site plan approval, to identify those appropriate locations. They are in agreement with the majority of what they heard about maintaining and preserving those trees and landscaping because that would be a benefit. However, the PUD does call for the utilization of fencing as well. **Commissioner Reisman** pointed out if this does pass, the residents he talked to at Corley Island, Lake Denham, and Ravenswood said they would like to see a fence along the entire residential border while saving as many mature oaks as possible. **Mr. Opsahl** indicated that they would be happy to work with staff on that, and it is already listed in the PUD ordinance that they would be required to put in fencing, so they would need to comply. There are some residents on the south side that have some really nice trees, and they do not want to have a fence there, but he was confident that they could work with staff to come up with an appropriate fencing requirement. **Commissioner Pederson** added that he had said it before on residential developments and that is because it then becomes an HOA issue, but he really did not care about the fence, but if the neighbors wanted it, he was fine. However, he worries that after five years the fences will not look good. That would be a bigger issue if there was an HOA, but in this

case, it would be on the apartment owner. He also appreciated the improved parking because that was important.

Commissioner Reisman said he was curious and wanted to know if there would be any opposition to putting verbiage in the PUD that stated they would never go live/local? **Mr. Opsahl** said with Dominion, as a company, they want to work with the municipality and the jurisdiction. They would work to avoid putting forth a live/local act as opposed to all the great things and conditions they were able to put into this PUD ordinance. They could definitely address that, and they would be happy to agree to no live/local. He noted that it was a pretty big act, and it is still new and some of which have favorable tax rebates for the purchase of construction equipment, so there are slivers there. However, they are agreeable to not asserting the live/local as it relates to density and permissible uses. **Commissioner Reisman** wanted to confirm that he said the intersection warranted a traffic light. **Mr. Opsahl** agreed. It is called a traffic signalization warrant study and all indications, just to be candid, are that traffic signalization will be required. However, they still have to go through that study with FDOT.

Commissioner Reisman asked him to define affordable housing, because he heard Section 8, so he would like more clarity on that. **Mr. Opsahl** responded that the old Section 8 is a creature of decades ago. It really does not exist in its current format. They are dealing with federal tax incentive programs and what they do is, these tax incentives allow these Class A buildouts with certain tax incentives that allow a more efficient buildout and the ability to have lower rents. There are folks present on the project team that could really get into the nitty-gritty of how that works, but that old Section 8 moniker and run by the government, things like that are not what this is because they are utilizing tax incentives.

Commissioner Pederson remarked that he wanted to make sure that the audience was clear on that because he also heard concerns about this. However, he calls this affordable housing. He did see one of the newspapers call it a low-income project and that term was used loosely. He wondered if he could quickly explain the difference. **Mr. Daniels** stated that this would be a low-income housing tax credit. It is a tax incentive for large banks and investors, and they are required to meet some community requirements. They are supposed to pay back to the community and in exchange, they get tax credits. They end up taking those tax credits and selling them to the investor. Now, the way this is different than Section 8 is that Section 8, as it was known in the past, does not exist anymore. That was abolished in the mid-1980s. Now, what people know as Section 8 are vouchers that the residents carry to any property. They are different because they attain a different income band, which is a higher income band, so what they are talking about are librarians, the starting salary of nurses, teachers and such. **Commissioner Pederson** thanked him for clarifying that because he did not want the public to know this was not a voucher subsidized housing. It just provides the developer with tax credits, i.e. lower rents. **Mr. Opsahl** then said it allows private development of these types of uses rather than ongoing subsidies or governments engaging in them themselves and the results speak for itself.

Commissioner Pederson indicated that he also expressed his concerns over traffic. However, he wanted to point out that there was a need for this type of housing and the county approved the bond, which was a 5-0 vote. **Mr. Opsahl** agreed that it was a unanimous vote, so they do have the county's support. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any further questions or comments by the commission.

Commissioner Connell stated that the city has a real traffic issue. At this point, everybody needs to acknowledge that we have some real traffic problems in town and bringing in more residential development is not going to help the problem. It will only make it worse. The last count, plus or minus, the city has over forty thousand residential lots already approved on the books that still need to be built. Out of the forty thousand, at least thirty thousand are located in South Leesburg. If they take the stretch of US 27 from the intersection of US 27 and CR 48 down to Dixie, no one can bypass that area. There is no way to bypass that stretch of US 27 unless you pull into Singletary Park and take a boat. By adding more and more traffic onto this stretch of road that you cannot bypass makes absolutely no sense. The

property is presently zoned commercial, and he heard tonight that commercials bring in more trips than residential. Well, if you look at it this way, a commercial development may bring more trips to the site, but there is already local traffic. This complex will bring new traffic into the area, whereas a commercial development would just funnel the traffic we already have. It does not add more traffic to the road. Yes, they are working with FDOT, but he does not see how in the world anyone will be able to get out of this complex to go across US 27 and go north. It is impossible. As far as the reduced parking, is he to believe that a three- or four-bedroom apartment only needs 1.6 or 1.8 parking spaces per dwelling unit? Do these people ever have guests over? That makes absolutely no sense. That would be fifteen units an acre. That density is absurd. Absolutely absurd. It would be in the best interest of the city to leave this property commercial since it is presently zoned commercial. We need commercial development. We do not need any more residential development, especially at this density or at this location, because it is already bottle-necked. He urged the commission to deeply consider turning this project down. The density is just way too high and the traffic issues on that stretch are horrible and no one can get out of it because there is no way to bypass that. **Commissioner Burry** commented that this property currently has two different land uses. Two years ago, the commission went through the comprehensive plan in depth to figure out where things should go and to make sure the zoning was correct on everything. So, he was not in favor of changing the zoning to all commercial. The commission needs to leave the zoning as it is, so he was not in favor of this project. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any other comments.

Commissioner Reisman indicated that they needed clarification on the site plan. **Mayor Berry** stated they were to vote on item 6.A.1 only. **PZD Miller** stated that both site plans were in the packet and the one that is 2.0 is the one that came in the packet, but the one with 1.6 parking, which gives the larger buffers, is the one that the applicants would like to switch to. **Commissioner Pederson** stated that the developer just clarified that he could keep the buffering while keeping the parking at 1.8. **CM Minner** explained that the applicant needed to clarify what they would like the commission to vote on. Would it be the one with more parking or less, because they were both in the packet. **Mr. Opsahl** noted that the PUD requires a conceptual plan. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that they were only discussing the future land use right now. **CM Minner** then stated that all the commission needed to do was to vote on the motion on the floor which changes the zoning. They are not voting for the PUD at this time. **CA Watson** agreed. They are only looking at the future land use/comp plan. **CM Minner** reiterated that the motion on the floor is a good one, and it only considers the change to multifamily.

The roll call vote was:

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

Three yeas, two nays, the Commission adopted the ordinance.

- 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)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 26-02

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

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

Mayor Berry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated that they did need clarification on which site plan to vote on, and the applicant indicated that they were willing to go to 1.8 on the parking. That is the one that they would like to have move forward. **Commissioner Pederson** mentioned that they would leave the existing buffers. **CM Minner** said that the 1.8 needs clarification. With the parking, would that be the maximum or the minimum of 1.8? **PZD Miller** stated that 1.8 would be the minimum. **Commissioner Pederson** stated that the 1.8 would be fine, because they indicated that they would be able to maintain the current buffering at 1.8.

Mr. Opsahl pointed out that the PUD has a minimum buffering, and it requires a conceptual plan, so they would continue to utilize the conceptual plan, and work with staff on the 1.8 parking. **CM Minner** explained that what they are voting on is a PUD, as discussed, and the PUD that they would vote on is with minimal parking/maximum buffering. **CA Watson** added that if anyone wants to amend that, to add the agreement to not allow any live/local prohibition, as discussed along with the 1.8 parking.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to amend the motion to include the prohibition of any live/local and the parking will be at 1.8 while keeping the buffers as is. Commissioner Pederson seconded the amended motion.

Mayor Berry asked if there were any other questions. **Commissioner Connell** wanted further clarification of what they were asked to vote on.

CM Minner explained that there was a motion on the floor to approve the PUD, which Commissioner Reisman made a motion to amend the original motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Pederson to change the parking plan to 1.8 minimum parking and that would be minimum parking/maximum landscaping. Along with prohibiting any live/local. They are only voting on that amendment, then they will move back to the vote on the PUD with the amendments. **Commissioner Connell** pointed out that they were technically voting to reduce the parking, because there should have been two parking spaces per unit. The 1.8 is a decrease from what the land development regulations call for. **CM Minner** agreed. That was how he understood it. They are voting for minimum parking/maximum landscaping. **Commissioner Connell** stated that 1.8 parking does not even meet the land development regulations, so it is a decrease from our land development regulations. **CM Minner** agreed and stated that the motion that was made had two parts. It is the smaller parking, it is not the code parking. There is less parking than the code requirement, but more landscaping and a prohibition on live/local. That is the amendment that they are voting on.

The roll call vote was:

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

Three yeas, two nays, the Commission approved the amendment.

CM Minner indicated that they now need to vote on the motion as amended to approve the PUD.

The roll call vote was:

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

Three yeas, two nays, the Commission adopted the ordinance as amended.

Mayor Berry called a five-minute recess at 6:46 pm to allow the public to exit the meeting. The meeting reconvened at 6:50 pm.

- 3. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 7.80 +/- acres from City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to SPUD (Small Planned Unit Development) to allow for commercial and light industrial uses for a property generally located north of Commander Road and east of U.S. Highway 27, lying in Section 11, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Leesburg Flex)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 26-03

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

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

Mayor Berry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated this project was called the Leesburg Flex. It consists of rezoning only. There is no annexation or comprehensive plan involved. The site consists of 7.8 plus or minus acres. It is generally located on the east side of US Highway 27, north of Commander Road. The request is for approval of a future development which consists of flex space warehouses. Flex space is pretty much what we have located right across from the bowling alley on West Main Street. They have an office in the front and a warehouse in the back. This would change from PUD to SPUD with revised conditions because we did not have a SPUD when this one was originally zoned. The old PUD allowed for an assisted living facility. With city department responses, they received no substantive comments. This does not impact the school board since there will be no residential uses. Lake County Public Works did not have any comments. They did not receive written responses, but they did meet with one of the neighbors who was present, and he would like to speak to discuss the buffer, setbacks, noise concerns, air filtration, and a few other items. Under the terms of the agreement, the proposal consists of industrial flex space and multi-tenant uses. This would be a small bay flex space. It would include warehouse distribution, logistics, light manufacturing, fabrication and assembly of non-hazardous type items, contractor trades, offices with indoor storage, wholesale trade, technology and printing, and indoor storage. The intent of

this PUD is to utilize only light industrial type uses, not heavy industrial, which he wanted to make very clear because sewing clothes and digging a mine are both industrial uses. They are only talking about light industrial uses. There are six buildings proposed on the site with a maximum building height of two floors. There is opaque fencing or a wall required where the property is adjacent to residential on the east side. Thirty-five percent of open space and dark sky lighting are required along with a code-compliant landscaping plan. The conceptual site plan was included in the packet. There is access shown on the site plan. There is one primary access point because that is all they need. The PUD requires the developer to provide any and all expansions or upgrades to the access points and driveways as required by FDOT on Commander Road and Lake County or FDOT on US 27. This project will be on city water and wastewater. There will be no wells or septic. They included the standard phasing clause in this project that would revert it back to RE-1 zoning after four years if there is no substantive development. The planning commission recommended approval of this by a 7-0 vote. They do have one gentleman present that would like to speak. Rick Blount and Danielle Parker of Blount Development were present, along with several other representatives of the development to answer any questions. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any questions for the planning and zoning director? There were none. She asked the developer if he had any comments.

Rick Blount of 5429 CR 125, Wildwood, congratulated Mayor Berry on being appointed as mayor. He said this project was not really controversial. Thank goodness. It does something that Commissioner Connell mentioned earlier. It keeps jobs local, and it would hopefully cutdown on traffic in that area. This would be located right off US 27. For those not familiar with the location, it is to the right at the front entrance to Hawthorne. They are really proud of this project. The consultants told them it would bring between sixty-eight and ninety-five jobs as a minimum. His company is actually located in one of these types of units right off CR 44 in Wildwood behind Sparr. They have five staff members working out of that unit, and it is about 1,250 square feet. This development would have a minimum of 1,500 square feet per unit. There will be about thirty-four units. They are excited about keeping jobs in the area, as Commissioner Connell mentioned. It would be nice if people did not have to drive all the way through town to go to work. Hopefully, they will be able to keep some people from having to drive far out of town and help with some of the traffic issues. He would be happy to answer any questions because they went over the project at the first reading pretty well. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any questions for Mr. Blount? There were none. She asked for public comments.

Larry Boyce of 4755 Commander Road said his residence is located at the very end of the road on the east side of the proposed development. He had a few concerns about getting along with the development. He wanted to go on the record saying that some of the homeowners in the area wanted to address the concerns that could impact their residents. They think addressing these issues could help reduce some of the impact with minimal effect on development. The number one would be light industrial zoning. He was not up to all the zoning codes, but he did speak with the planning and zoning director earlier, and he explained it to him. However, when he had his business in Leesburg, he had to come in and apply for light industrial zoning because he had an outdoor dust collector. So, one thing he would like to see was no outdoor equipment that was non-essential. However, he does understand air conditioners and things like that. He did not want things stored outdoors. He knows Hawthorne on Monday mornings has to run their little circulating pump on their water treatment plant, but that only runs for an hour. He would like to see a limit on the hours of operation. He does not want to see somebody out there banging on a car at eleven o'clock at night or six o'clock in the morning. With the setbacks, it sounded like it was crucial to the building, but he has a big site plan for that because he also looked at making a Class A RV park there, and he decided against it about a year ago. He went out and measured it today and there is two hundred and thirty feet from the wetlands pond on the west side to his property line according to scale, so he would like the setback addressed.

Ricky Howell of 4760 Commander Road wanted to back up what was said by Mr. Boyce. They would like to have more of a buffer, more than what was proposed. They are proposing ten feet, and we would like at least twenty-five feet. They would also like it to be an eight-foot masonry wall, and they would like it to come from the northeast corner and come all the way around to the east of the entrance. It would provide the residents there with a buffer and, that way, they do not see it or hear it as much. Overall, it is a nice project, they could not have asked for anything better, but it will still have an impact on the residents. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any further public comments. There were none. She asked for commission comments.

Commissioner Burry stated there is one other flex space in Montclair. Do we know what the setbacks there were? **PZD Miller** replied that he remembers on the residential side it was closer to twenty-five feet, but he could not remember the exact number. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know what the setbacks were from commercial to residential. **PZD Miller** responded from commercial to residential. There is not a defined setback in the commercial. They could go down to zero if they put in a firewall. **Commissioner Connell** remarked that he was talking about zoning. He wanted to know what it was from a commercial piece of property to residential property. **PZD Miller** answered yes, there is no standard number. Generally, both sides add up to one and on this one they could put in the number that they want because it is a SPUD. Generally there is not a specific number. It usually has to add up to fifteen to answer the question specifically, but in a PUD, they can make it whatever they want. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to verify that it could be that tight. **PZD Miller** agreed. It is quite tight. However, in commercial zoning, they could go down to a zero setback if they build a firewall. On this particular property, there is a ten-foot buffer and a fifteen-foot setback, but the buffer lies on top of the setback. They lay on top of each other, and they start at the same point, so it is essentially fifteen feet from the property line. **Commissioner Connell** asked, in this particular case, what the proposed setbacks were in the front, side and rear. **PZD Miller** answered that the building setbacks as measured by the property lines are on the north twenty-five, on the south it is thirty, and on the east and west they are both fifteen. The first ten feet of that is a buffer. So, essentially, it is fifteen feet. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know where the residents lived because there are lots on the front, back, and sides. **PZD Miller** explained at the end of Commander it deadends, and there are three residential homes. **Mr. Howell** stated that the east end is where Mr. Boyce lives, and he would take the blunt of this. Miss Lillian is in the middle, and he lives across the road, so he will not have as much of an impact. However, that is why they would like to have a wall and a buffer. **Commissioner Connell** asked if that was the area that they were looking at that was only ten feet. **Mr. Howell** agreed. It is on the east side. **Mr. Blount** pointed out that Mr. Howell was located at the end of Commander Road to the south. So, he does not border this property. He talked to him and Mr. Boyce in the lobby prior to the meeting. Referring to a rendering, Mr. Boyce is the larger home site that they see there. It is a white building with a dock. He addressed some of his concerns with him prior to the meeting, and he believed that they had worked them out. One thing in the PUD that can be added is to require on all residential borders a minimum of an eight-foot fence. They would be willing to amend that because there is also a buffer there of ten feet. They are willing to compromise on these concerns and another concern he heard prior to the meeting was dust collectors that ventilate from manufacturers, especially furniture manufacturers. They do not want that ventilator aimed toward the homes and there are also environmental concerns because it could be combustible occasionally by the dust it could create. He wanted to have it read into the record that any area bordering residential areas in the southeast corner would make sure that all dust collectors, if needed, are not aimed at the residential homes. They would be vented away from the residential in the southeast corner because that other property there is Hawthorne's parking area for boats and RVs. That is more of an outdoor industrial parking area. The buffer they worked very hard on. It was a difficult process to get all the different setbacks on the property because they are protecting the wetland as well. They are not going to impact on the building at all. This has been very well-thought-out. This is not something that they just sketched out. This took a lot of thought, a lot of time, a lot of effort and money. The fifteen-foot setback is important in

the southeast corner, because it borders that entire corner and east end. However, they would be willing to be a good neighbor and put those other provisions in the PUD. **Commissioner Connell** said that he would have the same question for the people that live in that area about whether they were willing to limit the hours of operation outside the building. **Mr. Blount** replied that it was the first that he had heard that, and he did not think that was something that he could do. As he said, he is also in a complex that has sixty-plus units, and there will be occasions where he goes in at eight o'clock at night to work in his office because that is where all his projectors are and a lot of his equipment. He does not disturb people, so he could not imagine how that would work in practical terms. **Commissioner Connell** pointed out that he was referring to people working outside the units in the parking area, not inside the units. He was referring to it from a noise standpoint, because this is fairly close to residential areas, so he understands where he was coming from, because he would not want to hear somebody banging around out there at nine or ten o'clock at night.

Danielle Parker, a staff member of Mr. Blount's, stated there were uses that were not included just for that reason. Things like auto mechanics were not included because they did not want big piles of cars sitting all over the place. Nor do they want them working at night. A lot of the list of uses were already taken off that list, so that would not be a problem. **Mr. Blount** added that they actually tried to address a lot of things because they have been working on this for a very long time, and they have gone through the list together with city staff in order to make it where it is appealing, in order to bring some jobs here. They did not want to be so restrictive that nobody could utilize it, because there may be catering kitchens that load or unload their trucks at eight o'clock at night. He does not want to restrict them from coming in to unload the truck into the unit. **Commissioner Connell** said he just did not want somebody outside banging around on something because that is different from unloading a truck. He does understand the neighbor's concern about that. **Mr. Blount** remarked that they want to be good neighbors with the residential neighbors. **PZD Miller** added that within the restrictions of the PUD all the work has to take place inside. There will be no outside work.

Michael Madill of 5688 Thomas Road said he wanted to make one clarification. Mr. Blount mentioned that they would build an eight-foot fence along the two parcels for screening, which is about three hundred feet, as opposed to wrapping it all the way around the development. It would just be that section. **Commissioner Pederson** stated they referenced a ten-foot buffer. Is it landscaped in any way? He wanted to help reduce the sound with buffering. **Mr. Blount** agreed. They also include a buffer. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any other public comments. There were none.

Commissioner Burry asked the city attorney about whether they needed to amend the SPUD to address the eight-foot fence. **CA Watson** answered yes. They would need to make a motion. If it were the desire of the commission to include any of the changes that were discussed, there would need to be an amendment. **Commissioner Pederson** said he thought the PUD said six to eight feet. **CM Minner** pointed out that in the PUD it is written six to eight feet. So, they may want to make an amendment to make it eight feet.

Commissioner Burry made a motion to amend the SPUD for an eight-foot fence along that three-hundred-foot section that abuts the neighboring residential area in the southeast, and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Commissioner Reisman asked if they needed to include language about dust collectors. **PZD Miller** aside they could add language about the dust collectors. However, as far as staff is concerned. They could restrict it, so that they point towards the front, because the only time dust collectors come into play is if they were a furniture builder. It is pretty uncommon. **Mayor Berry** asked if there were any further questions or comments. There were none.

The roll call vote on the amendment was:

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

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

Mayor Berry asked if there were any further questions or comments on the amended motion. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES:

1. None

C. NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida appointing one member to the Leesburg Firefighters' Retirement Plan Board of Trustees; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,179

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Berry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

CM Minner stated this resolution was to replace one member of the firefighter pension fund. This is the city's appointment. If they recall, the pension boards are made up of two representatives from the union, two representatives from the city, and one representative was jointly appointed by the city commission. William Middlemiss's term expired at the end of December, and this would be an appointment for a term of two years, ending on December 31, 2027. He was the only person who had applied to serve on the

pension board representing the city and the resolution was written that way.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to reappoint William Middlemiss to the Firefighters Retirement Plan Board of Trustees, and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

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 address.

9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

CM Minner said he did not have any additional items to address. However, he wanted to jump on the bandwagon and recognize Mayor Berry. It is pretty significant to have our first female African-American mayor in Leesburg's history. Congratulations! He was looking forward to working with her.

10. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Pederson had no items to comment on.

Commissioner Reisman said their TDC board met this afternoon. He was excited to report that the TDC allocated \$150,000 towards the Spring Games, that will be held in Leesburg and Clermont from February 13th to March 28th. The games bring in a lot of hotel stayers and out-of-towners who will enjoy our city. He was looking forward to seeing everyone this Saturday at the MLK parade and breakfast. Lastly, he congratulated Mayor Berry on her first meeting. He was looking forward to a great 2026.

Commissioner Connell had no comment.

Commissioner Burry had nothing to comment on tonight.

Mayor Berry congratulated all the students who were awarded a \$4,000 scholarship at the Villages MLK Junior Scholarship Awards Breakfast this past Saturday. She gave special recognition to Leesburg

High School students Ella Prader and Janise Wagner for their achievements. She was proud to announce that, and she wished them the best for all of their accolades. Finalizing, she thanked everyone for their support on her first meeting as mayor.

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 Reisman and a second by Commissioner Burry, the meeting adjourned at 7:19 p.m.