

**Official Minutes of
MARION COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

September 12, 2024

CALL TO ORDER:

The Marion County Board of County Commissioners met in a workshop session in Commission Chambers at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, September 12, 2024 at the Marion County Governmental Complex located in Ocala, Florida.

INTRODUCTION OF WORKSHOP BY CHAIRMAN MICHELLE STONE

Chairman Stone advised that the workshop was scheduled this afternoon to discuss the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR).

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of our Country.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call the following members were present: Chairman Michelle Stone, District 5; Commissioner Craig Curry, District 1; and Commissioner Matthew McClain, District 3. Commissioner Carl Zalak, III, District 4, was absent due to a prior commitment. Commissioner Kathy Bryant, District 2, arrived shortly after the meeting commenced. Also present were County Attorney Matthew G. Minter, County Administrator Mounir Bouyounes, Assistant County Administrator (ACA) Tracy Straub, Growth Services Director Chuck Varadin, Deputy Growth Services Director Ken Weyrauch, and Planners Kathleen Brugnoli, and Eryn Mertens.

The Deputy Clerk was in receipt of a 147 page Agenda packet to follow along with the PowerPoint presentation.

WORKSHOP PRESENTATION

1. Provide an Update and Receive Board Input Regarding the Comprehensive Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Report – September 12, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.

Growth Services Director Chuck Varadin presented the following recommendation:

Description/Background: The Board is scheduled for a series of workshops with Growth Services staff and their consultants, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., to review and provide input regarding Marion County's 2025 Evaluation Appraisal Report (EAR). The focus of this workshop is to discuss the conservation, recreation and open space, property rights, and future land use elements, as well as the methodology for identification and designation of Planned Service Areas (PSA) within unincorporated Marion County.

Florida Statute Section 163.3191 requires an evaluation of the Comprehensive Plan every seven years to ensure consistency with statutory requirements and community engagement. This report, the EAR, is due February 2025 with identified changes to the Comprehensive Plan to be completed within one year.

Recommended Action: Staff is seeking Board discussion.

Growth Services Director Chuck Varadin provided a brief overview of what will be addressed today relating to the EAR.

Commissioner Bryant arrived at 3:03 p.m.

September 12, 2024

Mr. Varadin stated the goal today is to review the matrix contained in the Agenda Packet and have the necessary conversations.

Blair Knighting, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (KHA), Grand Bay Parkway West, Jacksonville, advised that she is present to review the recommended changes to the County's Comprehensive Plan. She stated the matrix contains 4 entire elements, noting items highlighted in yellow are the topics the Board will likely want to discuss or that contain an added policy. Ms. Knighting noted when KHA approached the recommendations, much of it was a matter of simplifying language, Statutory compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, adding a definition section, removing redundancy, cleaning up language, and spelling out acronyms, etc.

Chairman Stone commented on the survey that has been open to the public. She stated every 7 years the County is required to review its Comprehensive Plan, and this process is known as the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR). Chairman Stone advised that based on the EAR, the County sends a letter to the State of Florida by the end of the year to let them know there will be changes to certain pieces of the Comprehensive Plan, but the County is not committing and completing those changes by the year's end.

Ms. Knighting stated the letter is technically due by February 1, 2025, noting after the letter goes to the State, the County has 1 year to make the changes. She commented on the progress relating to the community survey, noting there are 4 elements to cover today: 1) conservation; 2) recreation and open space; 3) future land use (including planned service areas (PSAs)); and 4) property rights. Ms. Knighting advised that the property rights element only has 1 change relating to the horizon date. She provided an overview of themes, community quotes/response relating to the online community survey, noting there have been 512 online reports. Ms. Knighting stated growth was a top answer relating to both what concerns individuals when thinking about the County's future and what excites individuals when thinking about the future of Marion County. She advised that the survey was slated to close in October, but the County can adjust that deadline if they choose.

In response to Commissioner Bryant, Ms. Knighting stated there are no safeguards in place to prevent an individual from participating in the survey multiple times. She advised that there are a lot of comments, and they are very diverse.

Commissioner Curry commented on the online feedback, noting the community meetings have not produced the same type of results.

Ms. Knighting stated the same is happening throughout the State relating to the community meetings. She opined that when there is an easy online option available to individuals, they are not taking the time to come in person. Ms. Knighting advised that in other municipalities, there was little public comment relating to the Comprehensive Plan; however, when it came to the Land Development Code (LDC), people came out. She noted the LDC is more tangible and addresses things like setbacks, building heights, etc. Ms. Knighting commented on the addition of policies regarding the Conservation element including Policy 1.2.3, which relates to Florida Statutes (FS) 163.3177(d)(2)(g). She stated this policy addresses working cooperatively with adjacent local governments to conserve, appropriately use, and/or protect unique vegetative communities located within more than one local jurisdiction.

Ms. Knighting stated the second policy relates to protecting surface and navigable waters by regulating the capacity, overuse, and habitat loss of these important resources. She advised that this was referenced somewhat in the Comprehensive Plan, but she worked with Parks and Recreation Director Jim Couillard on this subject to make it a policy (Policy

1.2.4).

In response to Chairman Stone, Ms. Knighting stated there is some red lined content and scrivener's errors, and changes to clear up some of the language within the matrix.

Ms. Knighting advised that objectives relate to something the County wants to do, and the policies provide how it will be done. She referenced Objective 1.3 relating to encouraging the acquisition of environmentally sensitive and/or locally important resources. Ms. Knighting worked with the Parks and Recreation Department regarding Policy 1.3.4, which states the County shall create a prioritization list of environmentally sensitive and/or locally important resources for acquisition.

In response to Chairman Stone, Ms. Knighting advised that she is unaware of any such list, which is why it was added.

Ms. Knighting advised that the next element to be discussed is the Recreation and Open Space Element, noting a recent workshop with the Parks and Recreation Department. She stated Policy 1.1.1 talks about the level of service (LOS) for recreation and open space in the Comprehensive Plan, which is required by State statute. Ms. Knighting advised that determining what the LOS will be is the Board's decision. She stated once the Board reviews the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, it can decide to keep the policy as it is or change it based on conversations with the Parks and Recreation Department.

Commissioner Bryant questioned if there is a park standard as far as a general LOS.

Mr. Knighting advised that there is a best practice, noting typically 2 acres per 1,000 individuals is standard.

Parks and Recreation Director Jim Couillard stated the overall Comprehensive Plan LOS is at 2 acres per 1,000 residents. He advised that if Horseshoe Lake and Carney Island are included the County meets the LOS, but questioned if parks and recreation opportunities are being delivered to other areas of the County.

In response to Commissioner Bryant, Mr. Couillard stated the LOS varies across the State and some local municipalities may have it even higher; however, 2 acres per 1,000 people is pretty common.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 1.1.6, noting language was added at the request of the Parks and Recreation Department relating to encouraging the connection of existing wildlife corridors and coordinating with the Florida Wildlife Corridor Foundation in this effort. She opined that this is likely occurring already, but the policy puts it in writing.

Ms. Knighting addressed Objective 1.3, noting a change in the language from "administrative standard" to "park planning best practices". She advised that policy 1.3.4 talks about requiring new residential developments to provide a minimum open space. Ms. Knighting expressed concern relating to language addressing the minimum open space per dwelling unit (du), noting it then references the future land use element (FLUE) Policy 2.1.4. She stated that policy reads a minimum of 350 square feet (sf) of open space for each residential lot.

In response to Commissioner Curry, Ms. Knighting advised that the requirement for 20 percent (%) open space in a new development is contained in the LDC. She commented on concerns relating to what open space is in the Comprehensive Plan versus (vs.) what it is in the LDC. Ms. Knighting stated this policy should be reviewed further to determine if it meets the intent the Board wants for new residential developments.

Ms. Knighting referred to Objective 1.4, relating to how Marion County will strive to ensure the design and development of parks and recreation, and open spaces provided within the County whether public and/or private. She noted the Board has been having this conversation in other workshops about amenities vs. open space, noting it is necessary

September 12, 2024

to review this objective when looking at the other policy.

In response to Chairman Stone, Ms. Knighting advised that the language should be clarified. She noted the previous policy references open space, but it does not mention recreation.

Commissioner McClain opined that further discussion is needed relating to the previous policy prior to making changes associated with this objective.

Ms. Knighting suggested a workshop on these specific topics before making recommendations for this section.

Commissioner Bryant clarified that nothing will be removed from the matrix until the final hearing occurs, so the Board can reference the material, consider any changes, and have further discussion.

Chairman Stone referred to Policy 1.4.5 under the Recreation and Open Space Element and requested clarification relating to transportation.

Ms. Knighting advised that this policy states all new parks and facilities shall be designed to provide connection to transportation facilities and other developments. She stated this policy should be analyzed to determine if it makes sense or if it should be rewritten.

In response to Chairman Stone, Ms. Knighting advised that the word "transportation" was already there, and she just highlighted it for discussion purposes.

Chairman Stone stated the County does not operate a public transportation system, noting the County utilizes SunTran.

Commissioner McClain opined that language should be added to clarify it is public transportation, as well as additional language that indicates "when feasible".

Ms. Knighting advised that Policy 1.4.6 was removed because it reiterates 1.3.4.

Ms. Knighting stated the next element for review is the FLUE, noting Objective 1.1 is Planning Framework. She commented on the language in this objective, noting adjustments were made to create a list format, add clarity and to condense redundancy.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 1.1.8 (Antiquated Subdivision Strategy).

Commissioner McClain requested additional information relating to Item 6 (promote a sense of place for residents), under Objective 1.1.

Ms. Knighting advised that it was added due to the belief that the community wanted a sense of place based on conversations with residents.

Chairman Stone stated the northwest has a farm/rural place, Silver Springs has the water, and the Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) has the sidewalk with the blue streak. She questioned if she was envisioning what Ms. Knighting is trying to capture. Ms. Knighting confirmed that is correct. She noted this is an objective not a policy, so it is non-specific.

Chairman Stone stated as the Board reviews overlay zones around certain areas of the County, it may help define this a little more. She requested this be flagged for future conversation.

Mr. Bouyounes requested examples of how this would be dealt with in real-life situations and how it would be applicable in the LDC. Ms. Knighting advised that the next step would be to add language like, "preserve the rural character in those areas" or "preserve and enhance the CRA".

Chairman Stone questioned if there is a way to include libraries and parks. Ms. Knighting stated providing community assets is a way to preserve and create a sense of place.

Ms. Knighting advised that Policy 1.2.2 was removed because it reiterates the maps that are adopted with the Comprehensive Plan, noting they will be in the table of contents in the beginning of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 1.1.4 (Private Property Rights).

In response to Commissioner McClain, Ms. Knighting stated this policy can be deleted, or the Board can choose to reference the element.

Commissioner McClain advised that he prefers to leave the policy in and reference the element.

Chairman Stone commented on Policy 1.1.3 (Accommodating Growth), which is listed as redundant to Goal 2.

Commissioner Bryant opined that the policy should remain for further discussion.

Chairman Stone requested that anything in the column marked "delete" remain until the last moment.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 1.1.5 (Higher Density/Intensity Uses), noting it references Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB). She stated there is only 1 UGB in Marion County and that language will be cleaned up. Ms. Knighting advised of internal notes relating to PSAs, to ensure that the language is correct prior to transmittal.

In response to Ms. Knighting, Chairman Stone stated the new language relating to infrastructure and services flows better.

Ms. Knighting referred to Policy 1.1.6 (Buffering of Uses), noting the word substantial was recommended to be removed.

Commissioner Curry commented on the community quotes relating to the UGB and opined that there should be additional language relating to infill projects.

Ms. Knighting advised that the FLUE can be reviewed and where it talks about directing growth in the UGB, there can be language stating, "encouraging infill within the UGB".

Chairman Stone commented on adding that language to Policy 1.1.1 (Marion County Planning Principles).

Ms. Knighting stated another way to encourage infill involves PSAs.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 1.1.7 (Discourage Strip Commercial and Isolated Development). She advised that this policy encourages interconnectivity between parcels, which can result in fewer trips on main roads.

Ms. Knighting commented on Policy 1.1.8 (Antiquated Subdivision Strategy), noting that encouraging the vacation of antiquated subdivision plats is an objective of the Board's and she wanted to ensure it is included in the Comprehensive Plan. She noted the clean-up of language relating to Rural Areas and Rural Land.

Commissioner Bryant opined that this relates to subdivision plats that have been approved, but have not been developed. She questioned if there are many plats from the 1980's just sitting there undeveloped. Ms. Knighting advised that Senior Planner Chris Rison has confirmed there are such plats.

Senior Planner Chris Rison stated on the last versions of the EAR and the County's assessments relating to expected demand, staff performed a subdivision analysis and looked at essentially all the County's subdivisions including those historic antiquated subdivisions. He advised that staff reviewed how many houses were built within those subdivisions over a period of time. Mr. Rison stated staff determined what the rate would be for that planning horizon, noting in the antiquated subdivisions that constructed 1 house over the course of 15 years, in the 15 year horizon staff said they will only do 1 house again. He advised that older subdivisions that began to gain interest in them, like Rainbow Park, were counted and as it became more cost effective for individuals to purchase further out and build there, staff could accommodate that within the County's growth. The anticipation is that as costs, charges and fees go up, more individuals will start to push further out as they look for that more affordable lot/site/location. He

September 12, 2024

commented on the associated challenges relating to fire, transportation, and other activities.

In response to Commissioner Curry, Mr. Rison stated this policy references the County's Transfer of Vested Rights (TVR) program, which is where staff is trying to encourage some of the very old subdivisions owned by 1 or 2 parties to try working together and voluntarily erase those subdivisions and return them to acreage. He advised that this occurred on 1 project off Highway 315, noting the owner vacated that subdivision that included 400 lots and transferred those vested rights to a site in the urban area in proximity to Belleview. Once that occurred, the land was put back to 10 acre tracts, restoring it back to rural lands that were compatible with the surrounding rural lands. Mr. Rison stated in some cases the properties involved are things like wetlands, flood plain, etc., and might go to preservation area. He advised that if they were not necessarily imposed by something of that nature or effected by something of that environmental quality, then staff would look for them to go back to acreage and be agricultural tracts. Mr. Rison stated it may be a matter of qualifying those areas as preservation, meaning environmental preservation or just agricultural preservation.

Commissioner Curry opined that the language appears ambiguous.

Chairman Stone commented on the language stating the County shall implement programs.

Mr. Rison stated the County has created and formalized the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

Ms. Knighting advised that this can be rewritten to make it less confusing.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 1.1.9 (Density and Intensity Averaging Allowance) and questioned if this is still the process the County wants to utilize relating to averaging.

Deputy Director Ken Weyrauch, Growth Services, advised that relating to properties that straddle the UGB line, PUDs currently allow for averaging of densities or intensities. He stated the question is does the County want to allow averaging to go outside of the UGB potentially adjacent to the rural areas. Mr. Weyrauch advised that in the UGB it is not uncommon to see a PUD with multiple land uses, noting they are allowed to add up the number of units they have and spread them throughout the project (averaging). He stated sometimes the homes are all clustered in 1 area and there may be a small amount of commercial in another area inside the project boundary.

Commissioner Bryant provided a scenario relating to a 10 acre parcel with 5 acres inside the UGB and 5 acres outside, noting the density inside the UGB is 4 du per acre and would result in 20 units for the property owner. She questioned if the Board wants to allow the owner to be able to spread those units across the entire property or only keep it in the portion of the property located in the UGB.

Mr. Bouyounes opined that this would be a method to prevent changes to the UGB line and be able to allow the owner options relating to their property.

In response to Commissioner Curry, Commissioner Bryant advised that if the Comprehensive Plan allows for this and somebody wants to do it, it will be difficult to say no.

Chairman Stone requested modified language that provides a step-down to the rural lands from the intensities that are allowed against them.

Commissioner McClain stated the natural consequence of removing the averaging would require a step-down approach.

Commissioner Bryant advised that the Board will be adhering to what the Comprehensive Plan says and what the public is being told on a consistent basis. She opined that she

would prefer to have a conversation with Commissioner Zalak, noting a lot of this is happening in Chairman Stone and Commissioner Zalak's Districts. Commissioner Bryant stated there needs to be a more comprehensive discussion relating to this matter.

Mr. Bouyounes commented on providing real examples when the subject is discussed again.

Commissioner Bryant out at 4:04 p.m.

Ms. Knighting referred to Policy 2.1.2 (Land Use Requirements), noting the addition of PSA to the language in this policy.

In response to Commissioner McClain, Ms. Knighting advised that there are currently no PSAs identified in Marion County.

Mr. Bouyounes clarified that areas the Board has discussed as possible PSAs have never been designated as such officially.

Ms. Knighting provided an overview of policies relating to FLU Designations, noting additional language is recommended in Policy 2.1.5 (Permitted Special Uses) relating to special uses being appropriate to the land use designation.

Commissioner Bryant returned at 4:09 p.m.

Mr. Minter stated many Counties utilize principal permitted uses within every zoning classification. He advised that there are then identified special uses within that classification and there is no notion of having special uses anywhere as long as the right conditions are added. Mr. Minter stated Marion County has been doing that and it has resulted in issues including On Top of the World (OTOW) where there was a special use to permit Commercial activities in the rural lands. He advised that it creates some confusion for property owners or applicants who see the special uses allowed under the zoning classifications, but then there is a category in the Comprehensive Plan that will seemingly allow special uses anywhere if the Board permits. Mr. Minter opined that this may create a number of problems for the Board.

Commissioner Bryant stated the Board should have a discussion relating to this topic, noting they have all been proponents of personal property rights.

Chairman Stone opined that this matter should be brought back for a specific conversation or attached to the other follow-ups.

In response to Chairman Stone, Mr. Minter advised that it is important for the Board to be clear on this policy relating to permitted uses.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 2.1.6 (Protection of Rural Areas).

Mr. Minter opined that the language in this policy should be updated to provide clarity relating to a vibrant rural economy outside the UGB.

In response to Commissioner McClain, Ms. Knighting stated perhaps emphasizing the Rural Activity Centers (RACs) in that policy would aid in indicating there is economy in rural areas.

Mr. Minter noted the definition with the Property Appraiser's Office (PAO) of an agricultural classification is that there is a bona fide (profitable) agricultural operation.

Chairman Stone commented on allowing necessities close to locations where individuals reside.

Commissioner McClain advised that this is a promotion of agricultural economy (farming, ranching, etc.), noting it is not just access to services, developments and businesses.

Mr. Minter stated the Legislature has been giving opportunities (e.g. a winery) to owners of rural lands to make it economically feasible to continue their agricultural operations.

Commissioner McClain stated he does not want to lose the intentional idea of encouraging agricultural economy.

September 12, 2024

Ms. Knighting commented on Policy 2.1.7 (Conversion of Rural Lands), noting there is a recommendation to strengthen this policy based on public input for keeping the rural lands rural.

In response to Commissioner Bryant, Ms. Knighting advised that adding language requiring compatibility with the surrounding area could help to strengthen this policy. She advised that work would continue on the language and to include the applicable F.S.

Mr. Minter commented on Item 3 under Policy 2.1.7 and questioned if the word "relationship" means proximity or if it has another meaning. Ms. Knighting stated the word proximity can replace the word relationship as it better represents the intent.

Mr. Bouyounes questioned what this policy adds, noting there is a process in place to change land use.

Commissioner Bryant requested staff provide information relating to what this policy adds prior to the next EAR workshop.

Commissioner Curry out at 4:27 p.m.

Ms. Straub stated there is some rural land inside the UGB.

Commissioner Bryant opined that the language in Item 3 should be rewritten to more clearly define that the Board is looking to see if the property is located within or outside the UGB.

It was the general consensus of the Board to strengthen the policy rather than deleting it.

Commissioner Curry returned at 4:30 p.m.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 2.1.8 (Community Facilities in Rural Areas), noting it reiterates the LDC and can be deleted if the Board chooses.

Richard Busche, KHA, SE 17th Street, advised that he has been a member of the County's Land Development Regulation Commission (LDRC) for roughly a decade. He stated when the Comprehensive Plan gives a policy and then ends with "as further defined in the LDC", as long as the policy is okay, an individual relies on the LDC to specify the details. Mr. Busche opined that this policy is probably okay if the Board agrees to the uses allowed in that rural area.

Ms. Knighting commented on Policy 2.1.9 (Landfills), which states there can be no new landfills or expansion of existing landfills. She noted the Board is having discussions relating to the Solid Waste operation and there is an upcoming Master Plan workshop.

Ms. Knighting advised that this policy can be addressed as that goes forward.

Mr. Bouyounes stated the County needs to be able to expand its landfill.

Ms. Knighting addressed Policy 2.1.10 (Wells and Wellfields), noting the redlined changes are minor.

Ms. Knighting commented on Policy 2.1.11 (School Siting Criteria), noting this falls under the purview of the Marion County School Board (MCSB). She stated language was removed from Item 7 relating to safe access.

Chairman Stone advised that there is a Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting tomorrow, which will be the first time since January.

In response to Commissioner Bryant, Chairman Stone stated there will be discussion relating to the MCSB site plan process and the need for site plans prior to construction. She advised that right-of-way (ROW) is needed for the flyover relating to the Hillcrest property and there is a SUP that has already been approved for the high school in Marion Oaks that stipulates if ROW is needed for that flyover the ROW acquisitions will be at the price the property was purchased.

Mr. Bouyounes stated Booster Stadium is on the Agenda for the next TWG meeting but he is unsure why.

Commissioner Curry questioned if there should be any language relating to access, construction and siting of schools, noting there has been a disconnect between parties in terms of planning for ingress/egress and transportation on to roads throughout the County.

Chairman Stone stated the Board believes it is required and should approve the MCSB's site plan; however, MCSB Attorney Jeremy Powers is unsure that is accurate.

Mr. Bouyounes requested more time to review additional language to make it very clear relating to submitting site plans.

Ms. Straub advised of a Statute change this year stating all schools shall be gated and the gates shall be closed. She stated the gates will only be opened close to the start and end of the school day. Ms. Straub noted that while the schools have indicated they have ample stacking onsite, individuals will not be able to take advantage of it and it will drive discussion.

Commissioner Bryant commented on the impact of that Statute relating to having participation in school libraries and parks.

Chairman Stone advised of a conversation with a State Representative who believes there are work arounds to this and if the County needs to request waivers, he is prepared to work through that in the State process. She commented on the balance between taxpayers getting their money's worth and keeping children safe.

Commissioner Bryant commented on the difficulty involved with allowing public use of a school library, noting even playgrounds would not be available except for afterhours and weekends. She opined that as development is approved, there should be ample recreational facilities for children that might end up living in those developments. Commissioner Bryant advised that law enforcement should be involved in the conversation, noting individuals might congregate in those locations during times when authorities do not want them on the premises.

Commissioner Bryant commented on the cost associated with new development and more children driving the need for more schools. She questioned if there should be a conversation relating to school concurrency.

In response to Commissioner Curry, Commissioner Bryant stated concurrency is optional for the Counties. She advised that the population in the County is approximately 413,000, noting it happened quickly and put more demand on all of the County's services.

Ms. Knighting stated concurrency is included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Bryant advised that when the Board approves development, there has to be some kind of evaluation relating to what that does to the needs of Fire Rescue, and law enforcement. She stated new developments are not paying for themselves when it comes to adding infrastructure and other services.

In response to Chairman Stone, Deputy Director Ken Weyrauch, Growth Services, advised of the firm Urban3 that would help perform a cost benefit analysis of the County based on taxable values and other criteria. He stated once the proposal is received there will be internal discussion relating to the matter.

Mr. Bouyounes advised that there will be a report from Marion County Fire Rescue (MCFR) relating to a full evaluation of new development and the impact on fire services. He stated there has not yet been anything provided by law enforcement and there has been nothing done for schools because there is no school concurrency.

Commissioner Bryant commented on law enforcement and questioned the cost to put a Deputy on the road. Mr. Bouyounes advised that it costs as much as \$150,000 for a Deputy's salary and equipment.

September 12, 2024

Commissioner Bryant opined that the County needs to be in consult with the Marion County Sheriff's Office (MCSO), noting the analysis is needed when there are applications for new developments.

Mr. Bouyounes stated a discussion with Sheriff William "Billy" Woods, the Board Chair and himself is likely needed.

In response to Mr. Bouyounes, Mr. Weyrauch advised that staff is trying to determine who to send the applications to at MCSO, noting there was a conversation today and additional discussion is required.

Commissioner Bryant commented on the length of time that has passed since the request was made and the number of additional residential subdivisions that were approved during that time.

Chairman Stone stated Deputies have been added over the last several years and it is possible the Sheriff may feel he is staffed appropriately.

In response to Commissioner McClain, Commissioner Bryant advised that when it is known there will be an impact to an area that will put stress on a system that is already overburdened and additional capacity must be added, it is important to know that before approving new developments.

Chairman Stone noted the Board is receiving feedback from MCFR and has requested additional detail, which she has been advised will be provided.

Chairman Stone stated Commissioner Curry requested there be more definitive language included relating to the site plan requirements.

Ms. Knighting referred to Policy 2.1.12 (Agricultural Uses Within an Urban Area), noting the addition of solar farms in agricultural land per Florida State Statutes (FSS) 163.3205. She addressed language relating to the continuation of existing agricultural uses on urban designated lands within the Urban Areas.

General discussion ensued relating to the use of "shall" and "may".

Ms. Straub questioned if there was a project on State Road (SR) 200 that did a PUD and had the land broker come back and request to put his cattle back on the site. Mr. Bouyounes advised that the request was denied.

Mr. Rison stated the emphasis under policy relates to some properties in the County that have changed their land use designation from Rural Land to other categories, while the zoning remained A-1. He stated those parties can continue operating under the A-1 until the day they get it rezoned. Mr. Rison advised that once the property has been rezoned, the new requirements are effective.

Commissioner Bryant questioned the benefit of replacing "may" with "shall". Mr. Rison stated by keeping the word "may" the decision is left to the Board. He advised that if the Board chooses "shall" and there is pressure for certain areas it can be an issue when a party seeks a zoning class that is not desired by the Board.

In response to Commissioner Bryant, Mr. Rison stated if an individual has agricultural zoning they can do the agricultural activity, if they do not have that zoning the agricultural activity is not an option.

Mr. Minter commented on the urban/rural interface and the mixture of uses, noting there is some concern for an individual who had an agricultural use and wants to maintain it while urban uses are developing around them over time. He stated residents of subdivisions can complain about the agricultural use near them; however, that use existed prior to the residential development. Mr. Minter questioned if this is a provision to protect the interest of the agricultural uses.

Mr. Rison opined that this does not pertain to that scenario, noting there is a State Law

provision that requires a note pointing out that the adjoining property is bona fide agricultural property and can do agricultural activities.

Chairman Stone clarified that Policy 2.1.12 should remain as is with the redline areas and adding the portion relating to solar farms. She stated the word “may” should remain rather than replacing it with “shall”.

Ms. Knighting advised that the language needs to clarify who “may” allow, noting the current language states the County rather than the Board.

In response to Commissioner McClain, Ms. Knighting confirmed this policy relates to existing agricultural uses not new.

BOARD DISCUSSION AND CLOSING COMENTS:

Chairman Stone requested direction on whether the Board wants to wait until they have been through all the elements before revisiting those that have been flagged for further discussion.

Commissioner Bryant stated between now and the workshop scheduled for October 1, 2024 the Board can review the remainder of the elements that they did not get through today and bring back any questions or comments relating to what is being presented. She advised that at the beginning of the next workshop the Board can discuss any questions they may have and then begin the new presentation.

Chairman Stone commented on the complexity of the task, noting she wants to have more conversation to ensure the content is understood.

Commissioner Bryant recommended finishing this element on October 1, 2024, and also schedule another workshop date after that meeting.

Ms. Straub stated staff has already requested another workshop date.

General discussion ensued relating to additional workshops and the time frame for completing the Comprehensive Plan changes.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting thereupon adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Michelle Stone, Chairman

Attest:

Gregory C. Harrell, Clerk

DRAFT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK