

1 MINUTES, CITY COUNCIL MEETING AS LAND PLANNING AGENCY
2 JANUARY 7, 2014, 6:30 P.M.
3 CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1 S. CENTRAL AVENUE, UMATILLA, FL 32784
4

5 This meeting was convened at 6:30 p.m.
6

7 Present: President Eric Olson; Vice President Peter Tarby; Council members David Adams, Ralph
8 Cadwell, Donnie Kent; Mayor Laura Wright; Assistant Public Works Director Richard Hatfield; Land
9 Planner Greg Beliveau; City Manager Glenn Irby; City Clerk Karen Howard
10

11 **Review of Comprehensive Plan Update**
12

13 **Greg Beliveau**, LPG Urban & Regional Planners, said the complete rewrite of the previous
14 Comprehensive Plan which was reviewed at the Council workshop on December 9, 2013.
15

16 **Mr. Beliveau** said since the meeting we have delved into the Transportation Element. The Lake Sumter
17 Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has not identified any deficiencies or exposures in your level
18 of service in sidewalks, transit, and trails in their 2035 plan. They have identified a need for trails on
19 county road systems. You have no exposure from the MPO under those levels of service.
20

21 The Lake County School Board hired consultants to analyze school safety and sidewalk. Umatilla
22 Elementary, Middle, and High Schools were analyzed for sidewalk accessibility. At the meeting during
23 which the report was presented, Lake County Public Works and I raised deficiencies in their summary.
24 They outlined sidewalk connectivity and showed what they perceived as needs for all three schools. As
25 your representative, we said the potential sidewalks identified could not be built because none of the city
26 or county roads had sufficient right of way to install the sidewalks. We asked the reports be amended or
27 caveats be added indicating the right of way issue. The reports submitted to the MPO did not show the
28 comments we requested regarding lack of right of way. The reports were adopted by the Lake County
29 School Board. We contacted the MPO to ask who was responsible for building the sidewalks to connect
30 to the schools. The MPO said the local jurisdiction was responsible.
31

32 We put language in the document under sidewalk level of service (LOS) based on where financially and
33 physically feasible. We request you include that as part of your motion for transmittal tonight. If your
34 roads are not physically capable of putting the sidewalks in you should not have to go through extreme
35 measures to meet another government's adopted plan when they were put on notice of the issues. We
36 need to include this in our planning document. You would have to go through extreme measures to
37 include Eminent Domain to put in a five foot sidewalk to meet a level of service requirement by another
38 agency.
39

40 In the sidewalk component for level of service we need to add the caveats of being cost ineffective and
41 physically ineffective.
42

43 Another area was bus stops which have been put in by the transit system. We will show that it is the level
44 of service is the responsibility of the transit system and not the local government. Those are not your
45 burden, but the transit's burden.
46

47 The other planning documents from the MPO do not put the city at risk.
48

49 Adopting a level of service for Recreation is the only other area where there is a risk. If you adopt a level
50 of service for recreation you will be immediately deficient in land and facilities unless you annex North
51 Lake County Park.

52
53 You can use the recreation guidelines and not adopt the level of service. The state saw this as a big
54 burden for small cities. Use the guidelines and keep up your other infrastructure; make recreation a want
55 but not a must.

56
57 **Vice President Tarby** asked about the language with the Lake County School Board and sidewalks.
58 **Mr. Beliveau** explained the city is part of concurrency as far as the student stations availability and you
59 are still a partner with education concurrency. We have done away with the element because you do not
60 need to be burdened with the responsibilities of updating their education information. You still a partner
61 with them through the Interlocal Agreement. You coordinate with them and your permit information goes
62 to them.

63
64 **City Manager Irby** your motion will be to the City Council to recommend adoption and to move
65 forward.

66
67 **MOTION by Tarby; SECOND by Cadwell; to accept the Comprehensive Plan with the additional**
68 **wording to be financially and physically feasible in the sidewalk portion of the Transportation**
69 **Element and also in the Recreational Element guidelines could be followed not level of service.**
70 **Motion carried.**

71
72 **LPA Meeting adjourned 6:48 p.m.**

73
74
75
76
77 _____
78 Eric Olson
79 Council President

80
81
82 ATTEST:

83
84
85
86 _____
87 Glenn A. Irby
88 City Manager

89

Karen H. Howard, CMC
City Clerk