

# M E M O R A N D U M



## LAKE COUNTY FLORIDA

TO: Cindy Hall, County Manager

FROM: Brian T. Sheahan, AICP Planning & Community Design Director

THROUGH: Amye King, Growth Management Director

DATE: July 29, 2009

**SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan July 21, 2009 Workshop Summary**

Please accept this memo as a summary of the June 21, 2009 Comprehensive Plan workshop. This memo is divided into three parts, *General Direction*, *Discussion on Staff Comments and Public Input*. Please let me know if you have any questions.

### *General Direction*

- Commissioner Renick will assist staff with editing (including Comment 235).
- The LSMPO will bring back a discussion item on Comment 225 (Objective IX-1.1.2) relating to Transportation Concurrency.

### *Discussion on Staff Comments*

- **Comments 215 through 217:** Option A
- **Comment 218:** Option A, with a rewording: The adopted Level of Service shall be 4.0 acres of ~~Developed, or Open for Public Use~~ park land (developed or undeveloped) per 1,000 people in unincorporated Lake County.
- **Comments 219 through 223:** Option A
- **Comment 224:** Option A3, with the following change: Adopted maximum ~~lane width~~ number of lanes and LOS standards for specific roadways of concern. A list of roadways would be returned for approval by the Board. **Note:** LSMPO will work with Public Works Staff to create the specific list of roadways at a future workshop.
- **Comment 225:** Lake County Public Works Department and LSMPO will work on this Policy; place it on a future BCC Workshop Meeting for further discussion.

- **Comments 226 through 229:** Option A
- **Comment 230A:** Option A1
- **Comment 230B:** Option A
- **Comment 231:** Option A1
- **Comments 232 through 237:** Option A
- **Comment 238:** Option A, with one change on bullet #3: To enhance the regional transportation network, ~~spread~~ disburse demand for transportation capacity and maximize access to communities and centers;
- **Comment 239:** Option A

Citizen Comments:

**Citizen #1:**

- **Comment 218:** Asked for clarification of the change.
- **Comment 223:**
  - 5<sup>th</sup> bullet, he felt that “while maintaining traffic flow” should be added to the end of the sentence.
  - 10<sup>th</sup> bullet, felt that the following addition should be included: “protecting existing railroad corridors, encouraging and facilitating the location of industrial and commercial employment centers at central hubs along those corridors, and encouraging increased use of trail transport by industrial and commercial enterprises; and
- **Comment 226:** The first sentence states “Lake county, in coordination with the Cities” he felt that Cities should be replaced with Municipalities for consistency. **Note:** This edit was made.
- **Comment 229:** He stated that the wording being added in this comment is the same for both state roads and county roads; he felt that the wording should be different for state and county roads. He wants to make sure this does not conflict with green house gas policy. He also felt the limitation for driveways and curb cuts should not be the same for county roads and state roads.

**Citizen #2:**

- **Comment 223:**
  - 6<sup>th</sup> bullet, he felt that the word “those” should be added as follows: “Limiting those gated communities which prevent existing or future roadway interconnections;”

- Last bullet, he felt this was in conflict with Comment 231; he did not want to see developments put in bike trails that does not have or will not have connectivity for some time.

It was noted by the Commission that the comment states “whenever practical and appropriate”