

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

March 11, 2025

CALL TO ORDER:

The Marion County Board of County Commissioners met in a workshop session in Commission Chambers at 2:20 p.m. on Tuesday, March 11, 2025 at the Marion County Governmental Complex located in Ocala, Florida.

INTRODUCTION OF WORKSHOP BY CHAIRMAN KATHY BRYANT

Chairman Bryant advised that the workshop was scheduled this afternoon to discuss the Comprehensive Plan 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 Kathy Bryant, District 2; Vice-Chairman Carl Zalak, III, District 4; Commissioner Craig Curry, District 1; Commissioner Matthew McClain, District 3; and Commissioner Michelle Stone, District 5. 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, Senior Planner Chris Rison and County Engineer Steven Cohoon.

The Deputy Clerk was in receipt of a 17 page handout entitled, "Redlines Transportation Element" and 45 page Agenda packet to follow along with the PowerPoint presentation.

WORKSHOP PRESENTATION

1. Workshop to Discuss Updates to the Comprehensive Plan.

Growth Services Director Chuck Varadin presented the following recommendation:

Description/Background: 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 Evaluation Appraisal Report (EAR) identified changes to the Comprehensive Plan that need to be completed over the next year (by February 2026).

The workshop today is the third of ten workshops scheduled over a five (5) month period. During this series of workshops, the Board will focus on gaining consensus for proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan and discuss broader topics that will help set the vision for guiding future growth and development in Marion County. Today's workshop will focus on discussing Level of Service (LOS) for transportation, talking about the structure of the Transportation Element, and reviewing proposed edits to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Recommended Action: Staff is seeking Board discussion and consensus on the proposed edits.

Blair Knighting, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (KHA), advised that today's focus is on the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. She stated Amber Gartner is the

March 11, 2025

subject matter expert and will be presenting today.

Amber Gartner, KHA, SE 17th Street, advised that today's presentation will begin with addressing level of service (LOS) and concurrency followed by highlighting some of the proposed restructuring to the Transportation Element and the general redline changes.

Ms. Gartner addressed Florida Statute (FS) 163.3180 relating to concurrency, which states "The local government comprehensive plan must demonstrate, for required or optional concurrency requirements, that the levels of service can be reasonably met. Infrastructure needed to ensure that adopted level-of-service standards are achieved and maintained for the 5-year period of the capital improvement schedule must be identified pursuant to the requirements of s. 163.3177(3). The comprehensive plan must include principles, guidelines, standards, and strategies for the establishment of a concurrency management system." She advised that FS 163.3177 is specifically related to the Comprehensive Plan and the schedule of Capital Improvements. It states "Projects necessary to ensure that any adopted level-of-service standards are achieved and maintained for the 5-year period must be identified as either funded or unfunded and given a level of priority for funding." Ms. Gartner advised that when staff presented the preliminary tentative Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) they included an unfunded list of projects.

Ms. Gartner referred back to FS 163.3180 addressing concurrency. If concurrency is applied, then the Comprehensive plan must guide the principles, which it does. She stated the Board must consider the number of facilities that will be necessary to meet the LOS demands when establishing the LOS. The capital improvements element shall identify facilities necessary to meet adopted levels of service during a 5-year period.

Ms. Gartner advised that if the County has enacted transportation concurrency, then the Board must allow applicants for Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Development Order, Development Agreement, rezoning or other land use development permit to satisfy concurrency. If the applicant enters into an agreement to pay proportionate share, then they are deemed to have satisfied the transportation concurrency. She stated the local government may not prevent a single applicant from proceeding after the applicant has satisfied its proportionate-share requirement if the applicant has satisfied all other local government development requirements for the project. Ms. Gartner advised that an applicant shall not be held responsible for the additional cost of reducing or eliminating deficiencies, noting the improvement necessary to correct the transportation deficiency is the funding responsibility of the entity that has maintenance responsibility for the facility. In response to Commissioner Stone, Ms. Gartner stated there are redlines based on the input KHA received from the Board relating to changing some of the LOS standards. She advised that there could be a scenario, where due to other development traffic, the roads could reach the LOS sooner; therefore, a new development coming in would not be responsible for proportionate share because they are not required to correct deficiencies caused by others.

Chairman Bryant stated if the Board does not change the LOS and a new development comes in and creates a deficiency, then that developer is responsible for its proportionate share.

Ms. Gartner clarified that if the new development is the one causing the deficiency it is responsible for the proportionate share, regardless of the letter grade.

General discussion ensued relating to proportionate share.

In response to Commissioner Zalak, Mr. Minter advised that if a new development tripped a change in LOS than that developer would have to pay their proportionate share.

Ms. Gartner provided a brief overview of the different LOS standards as shown on the overhead screens.

Mr. Minter stated if the Board changes the LOS from LOS D to LOS B it will not automatically look like the picture on the screen for LOS B.

Ms. Gartner advised that LOS is the standard the Board wants the roadway to operate as, noting changing the standard does not mean the traffic goes away. She commented on the importance of planning and ensuring the roadways are located in the appropriate places and being designed for the types of the travel that will take place. Ms. Gartner stated the Comprehensive Plan does have a lot of transit policies, even though currently transit services are not heavily utilized, they could be in the future.

Commissioner Curry commented on the benefits of changing from a LOS D to LOS C.

Ms. Gartner opined that what Commissioner Curry is referring to is a LOS C that would be in a rural area. She stated the desire she has heard from the Board is to set a higher standard for what the County would like the roads to operate at and how they want the community to look and feel. Ms. Gartner recommended if the Board is setting a LOS D standard for urban roads, then a lower standard should be set for rural roads. This will still encourage the growth and the traffic within the more urban area. She stated there is an opportunity to consider alternative modes and different development types to assist with the LOS standards.

In response to Commissioner Curry, Ms. Gartner advised that if the Board wants to promote walkability and alternative forms of transportation then mixed use development is needed.

Chairman Bryant commented on the importance of having somewhere for people to go as it relates to walkable communities.

Commissioner Stone commented on developers that come before the Board who do not want to keep the Commercial areas and request a change to residential. She opined that the Board needs to be more stringent on the Commercial if they want to keep people in a walkable community.

Ms. Gartner presented a video showing examples of the different LOS standards on the following roads within the County: LOS A/B – SE 92nd Place Loop (Bellevue Beltway); LOS C – SW 60th Avenue, south of US 27; LOS D – SR 464 at SE 36th Avenue; LOS E – SE 32nd Street, CR 475 to US 441; and LOS F – SW 66th Street at CR 475A.

General discussion ensued.

In response to Chairman Bryant, Ms. Gartner advised that the State established what they call LOS targets for their facilities. She stated the urban areas are LOS D and the rural area is LOS C.

Mr. Bouyounes advised that the section of the roadway shown on the overhead screens, State Road (SR) 200 at SW 66th Street, is already constrained.

Ms. Gartner advised that development is continuing to occur in this area and traffic is increasing, but there is no physical way or desire to widen that roadway.

Commissioner Zalak questioned what will happen to the roadway when an additional 20,000 units are constructed on this corridor. Mr. Gartner stated the Board will have to consider other options such as the parallel corridors.

Mr. Bouyounes advised that the community is going to continue to grow and the Board has to begin looking for alternative routes in order to avoid SR 200.

Mr. Bouyounes clarified that the grant received by the County is for safety and access management on Highway 464/Maricamp Road all the way from Baseline Road east. Staff is working with the Department of Transportation (DOT) to come up with a conceptual

March 11, 2025

plan for the intersection. He stated most likely there will be an interchange.

Ms. Gartner addressed Policy 2.1.1, Implementation of Level of Service Standards, noting the proposed change is adding the language "The County may adopt specific roadways to be exempt from LOS standards through Ordinance". The word "fund" was added to make the next sentence state "The County may not be compelled or required to fund roadway widening or construction of new roadways outside of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to address new or unmitigated impact of development within adjacent municipalities and counties." She advised that the statement previously said "level service standards shall not compel or require the County to widen or construct new roadways outside the urban growth boundary in order to provide capacity." Ms. Gartner stated FS requires the County to identify the improvements in the 5-year plan to meet the LOS standards adopted in the Comprehensive Plan. She opined the current language is contrary to the FS; therefore, allowing the County to adopt specific roadways as exempt or being able to adopt different standards for specific roadways would address concerns and not compel or require the County to fund those improvements.

In response to Commissioner Curry, Ms. Gartner advised that currently in the Comprehensive Plan there is a rural scenic road and urban scenic road. The urban scenic road has a lower LOS letter grade standard. She stated KHA is proposing to make it one category (scenic road) with a LOS C.

Chairman Bryant advised that there has been a tremendous amount of development around the scenic roads in the southwest portion of the County. She stated in the northwest portion of the County the Board has put parameters in place so that there is not as much development. Chairman Bryant opined that it might be time to review the County's definition of scenic roads, noting the current definition may be placing an expectation on the road that cannot be fulfilled.

Commissioner Stone stated a scenic road cannot be enjoyed when it is bumper to bumper traffic.

Ms. Gartner advised that the intent was not to widen roads designated as scenic roads. She stated having a lower LOS letter grade does not mean there will not be traffic. The Board could consider having a constrained roads list, which is essentially what scenic roads are.

Commissioner Stone advised that a roundabout will be created at County Road (CR) 475A and SW 66th Street, which will keep traffic moving.

Ms. Gartner stated the roundabout will improve the LOS on that road, whereas the degradation of LOS the County is experiencing is because of signalized operations.

Commissioner Stone advised that the roundabout will preserve the canopied roadway, noting without it the road would be on a list to be 4 laned based on the traffic volume.

Mr. Bouyounes requested the Board review the list of scenic roads because a lot of things have changed since the list has been put into place.

Commissioner Zalak commented on changes made to the scenic road list approximately 10 years prior.

General discussion ensued.

Ms. Gartner addressed Policy 2.1.2, Level of Service Standards, noting the language added is "Major local roadways to be evaluated for transportation concurrency will be identified within the Concurrency Management Procedure (CMP) Database to be developed in conjunction with the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)." She advised that the reason for the change is because there are roadways that are not classified on the County's roadway classification map that the Board may want to

potentially track for concurrency as they are reviewing new development. Ms. Gartner commented on the changes to the LOS chart as shown on the overhead screens.

In response to Chairman Bryant, Ms. Gartner stated the reason for changing the category to scenic road and not keeping it urban or rural is because it is contrary to facilitating more traffic in the more urban areas than in the rural areas. She stated LOS B is not really achievable in those areas.

Commissioner Zalak requested a map of the scenic roads the change in LOS will affect. Mr. Bouyounes advised that the LOS in the rural area that is higher than the LOS in the urban area.

Chairman Bryant questioned if there is an example that would be considered a scenic road. ACA Tracy Straub stated the urbanized area is different than the UGB. She advised of the boundaries of the scenic corridor as it relates to CR 475A, noting the urbanized area is just south of SW 66th Street. Ms. Straub stated currently 66th North has a scenic road category of a B and the proposed change would be to shift it from 66th North up to 42nd to a C.

Chairman Bryant stated that portion is already a LOS C. She requested that prior to finalizing the Comprehensive Plan an analysis is done showing all the roads in Marion County right now that would qualify for scenic urban LOS B and scenic rural LOS C.

Mr. Bouyounes advised that staff will provide a scenic roads map containing the designations.

Ms. Gartner presented the revised LOS chart, noting the LOS D standard was left in place for roadways in the Farmland Preservation Area (FPA). She commented on the roadways that are exceeding LOS standards based on the 2023 CMP and the roadways that will still be exceeding the LOS even with the proposed changes. She stated based on the 2028 forecast, the change will affect 3 roadways Highway 484, CR 35 and CR 42, noting the Board is already planning to address Highway 484.

Mr. Bouyounes advised that CR 35 is part of the NE 35th Street corridor that is included in the Sales Tax projects.

Ms. Gartner commented on the proposed language changes for Policy 2.1.3, Analysis, and Policy 2.1.4, Determination of Impact. She stated Policy 2.1.5, Bicycle and Pedestrian LOS, was added, noting the language came from another section within the Transportation Element. Ms. Gartner advised that within the transition section there was the Policy 6.2.7, Multimodal Connectivity, which addressed transit, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. KHA took that language because it was specifically tying it to LOS and placed it in this section with LOS.

Commissioner Stone questioned if the Board needs to include more of a multimodal path versus identifying it as a bicycle and pedestrian lane. Ms. Gartner advised that the language can be changed to state bicycle facilities.

In response to Commissioner Stone, Ms. Gartner stated the Comprehensive Plan does not address golf carts.

Mr. Bouyounes clarified that the Board is not planning for golf carts.

Commissioner Stone advised that her understanding was this was the reason the County was building wide multimodal pathways on SW 80th Avenue and SW 34th Place.

Ms. Gartner advised that the statewide standard for a combined shared use path for bicycle and pedestrian use is 12 feet.

Ms. Straub stated in some instances the County has gone down to 10 feet to work with the right-of-way (ROW) available. She advised that the intention was for a shared use path for strollers, walkers and bicyclists.

March 11, 2025

Ms. Gartner advised that language can be added to address the bicycling sidewalks or shared use paths.

Commissioner Zalak opined that the Board needs to identify in the Comprehensive Plan at what percentage the LOS has to be at to begin planning for improvements.

Ms. Gartner advised that this has been added, but it is located in a different section.

Commissioner Curry advised that he has requested information from staff related to available capacity when proposed developments are brought to the Board.

Commissioner Zalak stated the LOS of an intersection within 2.5 miles of a project is more important, noting LOS on the roadway usually has capacity. The intersection is what typically causes the bottle neck.

Ms. Gartner provided a brief overview of the restructuring of the Transportation Element. She advised that Objective 3.1, Financial Feasibility of Development was removed and Policy 3.1.1 was moved to Policy 4.1.1 and Policy 3.1.2 was moved to 4.1.6. This change caused Objective 3.2, Intergovernmental Coordination, to be renumbered to 3.1 and Objective 3.3, Concurrency, to be renumbered to 3.2. Ms. Gartner stated Objective 4.1 Benefit-Cost Approach was renamed to Transportation Infrastructure Planning.

Ms. Gartner advised that Objective 6.2, Compact Development was renamed to Transit Supportive Development Patterns. Objective 6.3, Intergovernmental Coordination was removed and its Policies were moved to Objective 6.1 and 6.2. A new Objective 6.3, Transit Design Standards was created.

Commissioner Zalak expressed concern with access management as it relates to driveways and curb cuts.

Ms. Gartner addressed Goal 4: Provision of Infrastructure, noting Policy 4.1.1, Map Series, was moved from Policy 3.1.1, noting the language has been modified to update if required at least "every 7 years" instead of annually. This was done to align with the EAR process.

Chairman Bryant opined that outside of the Comprehensive Plan there should be policy set where these maps are updated every 3.5 years.

Ms. Straub advised that the maps are updated as things happen and it becomes necessary, noting it is not on a particular cycle.

Chairman Bryant requested the updated maps be presented to the Board during the annual TIP workshops.

Ms. Gartner advised that language in Policy 4.1.3, Transportation Network Analysis and Measurement states: "The County shall coordinate with the TPO to update the Congestion Management Database on a biennial basis." She stated Policy 4.1.2, Data Collection was updated to reflect current procedures and extraneous information was removed. Ms. Gartner advised that Policy 4.1.4, Planning Strategies, was added and relates to reaching 80% of the adopted service volume. The policy states, "The County should consider prioritization of capacity improvements for County roadway segments when the traffic volume reaches 80% of the adopted service volume, in accordance with Policy 2.1.1.", which is where the County established the LOS standards.

Commissioner Zalak opined the Policy should state "The County shall prepare a list of capacity improvements".

General discussion ensued.

Chairman Bryant stated the language should be as follows "The County shall document needed capacity improvements for County roadway segments when the traffic volume reaches 80% of the adopted service volume in accordance with Policy 2.1.1".

In response to Mr. Bouyounes, Ms. Gartner advised that the TPO provides a map

biennially showing absorbed or remaining capacity on each classified segment.

General discussion resumed.

Mr. Bouyounes stated the Board could begin considering road corridors at 75% of their capacity.

In response to Commissioner Stone, Mr. Bouyounes advised that this changing to 75% does not mandate the Board to do anything.

Commissioner Zalak opined that this does need to be in the Comprehensive Plan because it is setting policy on how to handle things.

Mr. Bouyounes stated all this would be doing is requesting staff to track and report the health of the roadway system to the Board on an annual basis.

General discussion resumed.

Chairman Bryant advised that it is the general consensus of the Board keep the 80% language in Policy 4.1.4, Planning Strategies.

Ms. Gartner referred to the map on the overhead screens showing roads currently at 80% of LOS D per the 2023 CMP, noting the roads highlighted in yellow (CR 25, CR 42 to County line(S); CR 35, SR 40 to NE 35th Street; SE 24th Street, SE 36th Avenue to SR 35; and SE 92nd Place Road, US 30 to SR 35) are unfunded projects listed in the TIP.

Ms. Gartner addressed the proposed language for Objective 6.1, Future Transit Service, which states: "It is the objective of the County to have all area within the urban growth boundary, Planned Service Areas (PSA), and Urbanized areas (per the FDOT Urbanized Area Map) within the County served by transit. In addition, potential connectivity to adjacent services shall be encouraged." She advised of the restructured numbering of the policies with this Objective.

Ms. Gartner advised that the proposed updated language for Objective 6.2, Transit Supportive Development Patterns states: "Marion County shall encourage transit supportive development patterns and may require the provision of transit facilities." She provided a brief overview of the Policy changes within this objective.

Commissioner Zalak commented on the limited public transportation available in the County.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. Bouyounes questioned if Policy 6.1.2, Transit Funding, is needed in the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Gartner advised that these policies under Objective 6.1 were in the Comprehensive Plan, but have been rearranged. She stated what was added to the Objective was related to PSAs in the urbanized area. The transit supportive lane use patterns was removed because it is now addressed in Objective 6.2.

In response to Ms. Gartner, Mr. Bouyounes advised that the County does fund a portion of Suntran through an agreement. He stated he is unsure the funding of transit needs to be a Comprehensive Plan policy.

Commissioner Zalak expressed opposition to language stating all of the UGB will be served by transit.

General discussion ensued.

Ms. Gartner addressed the changes proposed for Policy 6.1.3, Paratransit, which included an added reference to the Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB).

Commissioner Stone advised that the County is required by FS to coordinate with the TDLCB.

Ms. Gartner advised that Policy 6.1.4 was Policy 6.1.7, noting it was just reorganized to make more sense.

March 11, 2025

Commissioner Stone advised that Marion Senior Services currently has the contract to provide mobility for the transportation disadvantaged, but it could be a different entity in the future.

Ms. Gartner stated the language could be changed to remove Marion Senior Services and replace it with Marion Transit.

Commissioner Stone advised that she would prefer it state “an approved vendor” rather than a specific vendor.

Ms. Gartner stated Policy 6.1.5 was formerly Policy 6.2.6 and Policy 6.1.6 was formerly 6.1.9.

Commissioner Stone opined that “Park and Ride” might be something the Board may want to consider.

Ms. Gartner advised that there is now a transit line that goes out to the Ocala Marion County Commerce Park, which people have been utilizing.

Ms. Gartner stated Policy 6.1.7 was formerly Policy 6.2.5, noting the language did not change. She stated currently the County does not have mobility fees. It was the general consensus of the Board to change “shall” to “may” in this policy.

Ms. Gartner provided a brief overview of the policy changes in Objective 6.2.

Commissioner McClain referred to Policy 6.2.3 and questioned the meaning of minimum development expectations. Ms. Gartner advised that this is related to density, noting a higher density development would support transit service.

In response to Commissioner Zalak, Ms. Gartner advised that the language “including transit” was added to Policy 6.2.5 because it was part of the transit section. She stated in more urban areas a way a development could mitigate for those traditionally auto centric uses is by building a shelter on site or work with SunTran to provide service to the site. The developer would be doing things to encourage the use of non-single occupant vehicle modes of travel.

Ms. Knighting stated to reduce the LOS the Board could consider other ways to encourage lower trips, for example a shelter or bus station. This is another tool the Board can use.

Ms. Gartner advised that Policy 6.2.6 was formerly Policy 6.2.7, noting the extraneous information was removed. The proposed language is “Marion County shall encourage multi-modal connectivity strategies for new development to include, but are not limited to...”. She stated the list has been pared down to just things that relate specifically to transit and encourage connectivity to support future transit use.

Ms. Gartner addressed Policy 6.2.7 formerly 6.3.1., which refers to seeking enhanced multi-modal opportunities to support the Transit Development Plan.

Ms. Gartner provided a brief overview of Objective 6.3, Transit Design Standards.

Ms. Gartner advised that Objective 7 relates to Aviation. She stated Policy 7.1.6 is a rewrite to meet current FS., noting previously it was specific to private airports and land use. The Statute is really clear that the Board can only regulate the land use for public airports. She stated Policy 7.1.7 was added to address hazards and not land use, noting there are development standards that can be considered that are not related to land use and that is what this policy is intended to address.

Commissioner McClain questioned how is “vicinity” being defined. Ms. Gartner advised that KHA will look into clarifying the term vicinity.

Commissioner McClain opined that this policy should be broader and the details should be outlined in the land development code (LDC). He stated it is unclear how the Board will determine what safe operations are or if it is endangering lives or property.

Mr. Minter advised that KHA is working on proposed zoning regulations for airports and “fly in” communities. He opined that there may be some misunderstanding relating to what a fly in community is, noting people tend to think a “fly in” community and airport are one in the same. Mr. Minter clarified that a “fly in” community is a residential development, subject to the County’s zoning regulations that happen to have connections to an airport. He stated Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) registers private airports and they have total jurisdiction over the private airport itself. Mr. Minter advised that there is a provision in the FS relating to airport zoning regulations, but that is for public airports such as the Dunnellon Airport or the Ocala Airport and not so much around private airports.

Ms. Gartner advised that Policy 7.1.1 can refer back to the LDC to regulate it more specifically.

Ms. Gartner stated the maps have been removed from Objective 1.

In response to Ms. Gartner, Chairman Bryant advised that there is consensus for the proposed redlines relating to the LOS with the exception of having the specific scenic roads affected being brought before the Board for review.

Ms. Gartner commented on Policy 2.3.3, which was removed and moved to the Goal 6 Transit.

In response to Commissioner Zalak, Ms. Gartner advised that the transportation study done on the SR 200 Liberty Triangle was identifying the LOS of the roadways within that study area based on the development that was approved or contemplated at the time. She stated there are going to be other subarea studies done apart from the congestion management process that might be more detailed and identify the current or projected LOS within a certain area.

Commissioner Zalak stated the straight FDOT number model does not always reflect the County’s local roadways.

In response to Commissioner Zalak, Ms. Gartner advised that the language can be changed to allow the more in depth study related to volume projects performed by the County rather than the methodology utilized in the CMP for planning purposes.

Ms. Gartner addressed the changes in Objective 3.1.

Commissioner Zalak expressed concern with the meaning of Policy 2.2.1. Ms. Gartner stated this policy indicates the Board will establish through the development review process review of access management to reduce the number of access points to facilitate more traffic throughput.

Commissioner Zalak stated at the end of the day the Board wants SW 80th Avenue to truly act as a significant major corridor that moves traffic instead of every lane having a driveway. He questioned how the Board can set policy to achieve this goal. Chairman Bryant advised that this would be addressed in the LDC.

Ms. Knighting referred to Objective 2.3, Connectivity and the corresponding policies, which are specific requiring non-residential development cross access connections where available, sidewalk connections, closure of existing excessive duplicate or unsafe curb cuts, provide curb cuts in community onsite pedestrian circulation such as sidewalks and crosswalks connecting buildings and parking areas at the development site. She stated the tools are there.

General discussion ensued.

Ms. Straub advised that with all of the new corridors that staff is working on, they are performing access management as part of the overall plan. Staff does get kickback from the developers and they have started pushing back; therefore, the matter will come before the Board for consideration. She stated there are some specific criteria that staff is trying

March 11, 2025

to be very staunch about and unless there is an unusual reason staff will be sticking to the Code.

Commissioner McClain commented on push back the Board has received relating to infill projects and cross access to existing communities.

Chairman Bryant opined that to help promote connectivity where the stub outs are already located that something be placed on the record for people who purchase the properties understand that at some point the vacant property could be developed and the connectivity will happen.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. Minter advised that for decades around Florida there have been State and local agencies that have filed, recorded in the public records, things called Maps of Reservation. Many of them have been challenged in the courts. Most of those cases dealt with the idea that the County is anticipating it is going to need to widen this road at some point in the future and so the County filed this map in the public records showing the future widening of the road across private property. He stated if all the County is doing is recording the map showing what the plan is for the future so the County and property owner are on notice that is okay, but if it is recorded and tell someone that they cannot do something in that area because a road will be built there, then it becomes an inverse condemnation case.

Chairman Bryant advised that many times when someone purchases a property, they have no idea what the future land use or what the zoning may be on the property.

Mr. Minter commented on project progression and funding availability.

Chairman Bryant questioned if the maps could be updated annually along with the Long Range Plan. Mr. Minter stated it could be done.

Ms. Gartner advised that as part of this Comprehensive Plan there is a future transportation corridor map. This shows the long range plan.

General discussion ensued.

Ms. Knighting advised that the next workshop will be on Thursday, March 27, 2025 at 2:30 p.m., noting they will be discussing bring backs from prior workshops, landfills, solid waste, special uses and overlay zones. Also for review will be redlines pertaining to the Solid Waste Element and Sanitary Sewer Element.

Chairman Bryant advised that she has heard some comments made by the public requesting Commission meetings to be held in the evenings. She stated in the past they did try holding meetings in the evening. Chairman Bryant requested the Board consider whether or not they have an interest in possibly having the first meeting of the month in the evening for a few months to see if there is any more public participation.

General discussion ensued.

Chairman Bryant advised that when they tried it in the past there was no more public participation than there is at the current regularly scheduled meetings. She requested the Board provide their feedback to Mr. Bouyounes.

REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

March 11, 2025

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting thereupon adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Kathy Bryant, Chairman

Attest:

Gregory C. Harrell, Clerk

DRAFT

March 11, 2025

DRAFT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK