



506 WEST BERCKMAN STREET
FRUITLAND PARK, FL 34731

PHONE: 352 360-6727
FAX: 352 360-6652

SPECIAL MASTER: Amanda Boggus, Atty	Others: Michael Rankin, LPG Anita Geraci-Carver, City Attorney Sharon Williams, Administrative Manager Emily Church, Administrative Assistant
---	--

MINUTES
Planning & Zoning (P&Z) MEETING – SPECIAL MASTER
May 21, 2026
6:00 PM

-
- I. **INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Pledge led by Special Magistrate Amanda Boggus & Invocation was led by Sharon Williams.
 - II. **MEETING NOTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING:** Meeting notes from the March 19th and April 16th meeting included for review and were approved.
 - III. **RECESS TO THE LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA) MEETING**
At 6:10 or as early as possible thereafter
 - IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Discussion** – Planning and Zoning meeting time change from 6:00 pm to 4:00 pm along with the onset month.

Michael Rankin, Interim Community Development Director, introduced himself and recommended moving Planning and Zoning meetings to 4:00 p.m. on the third Thursday of each month, unless special circumstances require an adjustment. He explained that Planning and Zoning matters are now reviewed by a Special Master rather than a volunteer board, following voter approval of a charter amendment authorizing the change. Mr. Rankin also provided an overview of the development review process, including zoning regulations and the role of the Local Planning Agency (LPA).

2. **FPSF Stephenson Lane – Annexation, Large Scale Comp Plan, and Rezone/MDA - Alternate Keys 1288738, 1288576, 3870774, 1772494**
 - a. **Annexation - Ordinance 2026-007**
The applicant is seeking annexation of approximately 14.86 +/- acres to receive city services and develop 22 lot duplexes (fee-simple ownership for a total of 44 units). There are two (2)

existing homes on the property which are listed as detached single family residences. The property is located south of Myrtle Lake Avenue along Stephenson Lane.

b. Large Scale Comp Plan Amendment - Ordinance 2026-008

The existing Lake County Future Land Use designation is Urban Medium at 7 units/acre (or 104 max units). The development is proposing City of Fruitland Park Multi-Family Low Density. Ordinarily the land use designation would be classified as a small scale comp plan with only 14.8 +/- acreage; however, the applicant is requesting a text amendment change as recommended and supported by LPG (land planner) which limits the uses and prohibit multi-family land uses.

c. Rezoning Ordinance 2026-009

The current zoning for this property is Lake County R-1 and Residential Professional. The proposed zoning is Planned Unit Development (PUD). The PUD will limit density to 5 units/acre with a max number of 46 units. Also, the land use type will be limited to detached single family and duplex units. Open space is required to be a minimum of 25%. No recreational amenities are being proposed but, the applicant states there are plans to provide a pedestrian path leading down to the lake from the rear of the property.

The Special Master concluded the Local Planning Agency meeting and reconvened the Planning and Zoning meeting. Individuals intending to provide testimony on quasi-judicial matters were sworn in and advised that only competent, substantial, fact-based evidence would be considered.

Michael Rankin introduced the project noting proposed landscape buffers and noting that the applicant is requesting two variances related to roadway access and cul-de-sac length, both of which require City Commission approval. The applicant was given the opportunity to present the project, and the Special Master elected to consider the annexation, comprehensive plan amendment, and rezoning requests concurrently for efficiency.

Josh Conradi, representing the applicant, presented the proposed development located south of Myrtle Lake Avenue on approximately 14.68 acres. He explained that the project consists of 22 duplex buildings, totaling 44 fee-simple residential units, while retaining two existing single-family homes on the property.

Mr. Conradi stated that the project complies with applicable stormwater management requirements and includes on-site stormwater facilities. He also described the proposed building elevations, open space areas, and potential pedestrian amenities. The proposed density is approximately 4.6 units per acre. He noted that nearby approved and proposed developments allow higher residential densities and stated that the applicant is seeking a lower-density residential development.

The Special Master opened public comment.

Chuck Padgett, 1740 Myrtle Lake Ave, spoke in opposition to the project, expressing concerns about increased traffic on Myrtle Lake Avenue and the roadway's ability to accommodate existing and future development. He noted ongoing traffic and safety concerns near local schools and referenced previously approved developments that he believes have contributed to increased traffic volumes. Mr. Padgett also expressed concerns regarding the timing of planned infrastructure improvements, including sidewalks and utility extensions, and questioned whether additional traffic mitigation measures would be provided. He encouraged consideration of the

impacts on existing residents and raised concerns regarding the relocation of gopher tortoises on the property. He requested that the application be denied.

James Lenhart, 950 Hawk Landing, spoke in opposition to the project, citing concerns about increased traffic, noise, and the potential impact on the character of the surrounding lakefront community. She stated that the area has historically been a quiet residential neighborhood and expressed concern that additional residential units would further strain existing roadways and infrastructure. She also raised concerns regarding potential environmental impacts to the lake, including erosion, wildlife habitat, and water quality. She requested that environmental and traffic impact studies be conducted before the project proceeds and questioned whether the proposed density is compatible with surrounding development patterns. She recommended further evaluation of the project's environmental and infrastructure impacts prior to approval.

David Booth, 1111 Myrtle Breezes Court, spoke in opposition to the project, expressing concerns regarding the proposed subdivision of duplex units into individually sold fee-simple lots. He inquired about potential lake-related amenities, and staff confirmed that no marina or boat facilities are included in the proposal. Mr. Booth stated that, based on his professional experience as a residential real estate appraiser, he had concerns regarding the long-term compatibility and livability of similar duplex developments. He ultimately stated his opposition to the project.

James Mayfield, 1601 Calcar Cove, expressed concerns about trespassing and public access to the private lake, citing safety risks associated with wildlife, dock conditions, and water conditions. She also raised concerns regarding pedestrian and traffic safety along the adjacent roadway and the potential impacts of increased residential development on neighborhood safety, privacy, and overall quality of life.

Paige Booth, 1111 Myrtle Breezes Court, stated that she resides on the lake and expressed concerns regarding existing trespass issues near the proposed development area. She noted that the lake is privately owned and raised safety concerns related to unauthorized access, including potential risks associated with wildlife, dock conditions, and water hazards. Ms. Booth also expressed concerns about pedestrian and traffic safety along the adjacent two-lane roadway, particularly for schoolchildren. She stated that increased development may contribute to additional safety risks, liability concerns, and impacts to the residential character of the neighborhood. She concluded by expressing opposition to the project.

Fred Goller, 1109 Myrtle Breezes Court, spoke in opposition to the project, expressing concerns regarding the proposed density, traffic impacts, and compatibility with the surrounding area. He noted concerns about roadway safety and suggested that a traffic study be considered before further action is taken. Mr. Goller also raised concerns about potential impacts to the health of the adjacent lake, citing observed declines in water quality over time and questioning whether stormwater controls would adequately protect the resource. He stated that development should be compatible with existing conditions and suggested that a lower-density, single-family residential project may be more appropriate for the site. He concluded by expressing opposition to the proposed annexation and development as presented.

Mitchell Langley, 1604 Hoofprint Court, spoke in opposition to the project, expressing concerns regarding the capacity of existing water, sewer, and educational infrastructure to support continued development. He stated that additional growth may place further strain on public services and suggested that broader planning and infrastructure studies be considered prior to

approving new projects. Mr. Langley also raised concerns about environmental impacts, including water usage and protection of local waterways, as well as pedestrian safety and the need for adequate sidewalks and crosswalks in the area. He concluded by encouraging careful evaluation of infrastructure capacity and overall community impacts before advancing additional development.

Jeff Stanko, 1825 Myrtle Breezes Court, expressed general concerns regarding the proposed development, including potential impacts to wildlife, traffic conditions, roadway safety, and the absence of sidewalks. He stated that he moved to the area for its rural character and raised concerns that increased development could affect the existing community environment. Mr. Stanko also referenced observed wildlife on and near the property and expressed concern regarding potential impacts from construction activity. He noted existing safety concerns related to pedestrian and vehicle interactions on nearby roads and stated that additional development may further contribute to congestion and safety risks. He also expressed concern regarding potential effects on nearby property values.

Sarah McCallum, 2125 Miller Blvd, spoke in opposition to the project, expressing concerns regarding potential environmental impacts, particularly related to stormwater runoff and its effect on nearby spring-fed lake systems. She stated that such systems are vulnerable to long-term water quality changes and referenced other restoration efforts as examples of limited success once degradation occurs. Ms. McCallum encouraged further scrutiny of proposed developments affecting sensitive water bodies and emphasized the importance of evaluating stormwater management impacts prior to approval of additional development.

Josh Conradi, on behalf of the applicant, responded to public comments and addressed project details. He stated that sidewalk improvements would be constructed along the project frontage in accordance with development requirements and would connect to future adjacent improvements. He also noted that water and sewer infrastructure is proposed to serve the site. Mr. Conradi explained that the development consists of fee-simple duplex units intended for owner occupancy, with no proposed boat ramp, dock, or short-term rental use. He further stated that required gopher tortoise protections and relocation procedures would be followed in accordance with applicable regulations. He also indicated that stormwater management facilities are designed to meet state and local standards, with on-site retention intended to reduce nutrient discharge into the lake. He concluded by noting that the proposed density is under five units per acre.

The Special Master closed public comment and stated that the proceeding was a quasi-judicial hearing to determine whether the application met the minimum requirements of the land development regulations and comprehensive plan. The Special Master clarified procedural aspects of the proposal, including annexation requirements under Florida Statutes, the role of City Council in final determinations, and existing allowable density within Lake County prior to annexation. Staff confirmed that applicable reviews include environmental, traffic, infrastructure capacity, and school-related considerations as required by statute and reviewing agencies.

It was further noted that annexation, comprehensive plan amendment, and rezoning approvals must each be granted for the project to proceed, and that development would still be subject to infrastructure capacity requirements. The Special Master concluded that, based on the evidence presented, the application met minimum code requirements and recommended approval to City Council, advising that consideration would occur at the June 11th City Commission Meeting.

3. **Vita Serena – Large Scale Comp Plan and Rezone/MDA – Alternate Keys: Unincorporated 3884327, 1288347, 1288053 and 1288339 (Fruitland Park)**

a. **Large Scale Comp Plan Ordinance 2025-026**

The existing Future Land Use for all (4) four combined properties is: Lake County Rural for the three (3) parcels located within “Unincorporated” Lake County and Commercial for the one (1) parcel located within the jurisdiction of Fruitland Park.” The overall Future Land Use requested is Single Family Medium Density (requested for the total of 95.35 +/- acres). Development within this category is limited to single-family detached dwelling units and the density shall not exceed 4 dwelling units/acre.

b. **Rezoning Ordinance 2025-027**

The revised development plan is for 344 total units with a proposed gross density of 3.61 units/acre - consisting of 196 single family (SF) units on 40’ x 120’ lots (4,800 SF), 44 SF units on 50’ x 115 (5,750 SF), and 104 units on 50’ x 120’ lots (6,000 SF). The existing zoning is Lake County Agriculture and City of Fruitland Park C-2 with a proposed zoning of Planned Unit Development (PUD). The applicant is requesting that a waiver be granted allowing a maximum building coverage of 55% instead of 30% (per Chapter 154 of the city’s LDRs). An exception to the above setbacks is for the 50’ lots 23 – 35 with a rear setback of 14’ (unless adjacent to parking of 13’).

Michael Rankin introduced the project and the Special Master opened public comment.

Richard Wohlfarth, the applicant, was present and noted that they would reserve their comments until the end to address any other public comments.

Mary Thalid expressed concern about the removal of mature trees on the property, noting that many appear to be decades old and contribute significantly to the area's natural beauty. She stated that the loss of trees may negatively affect the environment, wildlife, and local character. Ms. Thalid described the site as one of the most scenic stretches of property in the area and urged decision-makers to consider preserving its natural features as part of the development process.

Karim, 2456 Bambridge Lane, expressed interest on certified letter requirements.

Sue Nolen, 257 Ellenton Run, Sumter County, inquired whether the presence of transmission lines had been considered in the development design and whether they would affect the number of proposed homes. She expressed concerns regarding the proximity of homes to the transmission lines and suggested that additional review may be warranted. Ms. Nolen also noted recurring stormwater runoff issues affecting neighboring properties during heavy rainfall events and encouraged further evaluation of drainage impacts.

Sarah McCallum, 2125 Miller Blvd, expressed concerns regarding the proposed rezoning from a rural designation to medium-density residential (R-4) rather than a lower-density classification. She questioned the requested increases in building coverage and impervious surface area, noting potential implications for stormwater management and environmental stewardship. Ms. McCallum also raised concerns about the adequacy of proposed green space and amenities located within a utility easement, citing possible limitations on their use and maintenance. Additionally, she encouraged further consideration of drainage impacts, development intensity, and compatibility with the surrounding rural character of the area.

The Special Master closed public comment and invited the applicant to speak on behalf of voiced concerns. Richard Wohlfarth responded to public comments by clarifying that the proposed development would retain required open space and include stormwater management facilities designed to contain

runoff on-site in accordance with applicable regulations. The applicant stated that the requested building coverage is intended to accommodate home sizes on the proposed lots and that the overall density is consistent with surrounding development patterns. The applicant also noted that landscape buffers would be provided around the property, utility easement areas would remain subject to utility requirements, and roadway maintenance would be managed through a Community Development District (CDD).

The Special Master confirmed that the application meets the City's current Land Development Regulations and Comprehensive Plan requirements, and that stormwater, utility, and tree preservation standards would be addressed through the applicable review and approval processes. The Special Master found the item met minimum requirements and recommended approval to the City Commission and noted this item would be heard at the June 11th City Commission.

4. CR 468 Subdivision Preliminary Plan – Alternate Keys: 1288843 and 1289912

The applicant is requesting approval of Resolution 2026-027 (Preliminary Plan) to construct a proposed development consisting of a 124-unit single family subdivision with a max density of 3.87 units/acre. The total open space is approximately 25.1% and includes an amenity tract of 1 acre. The minimum living area is 1350 sf; the existing zoning is Residential PUD and the land use is Single Family Medium Density at 4 units/acre. The Rezoning/ Master Development Agreement was approved via Ordinance 2025-013. NOTE: Sidewalks shall be provided on both sides of the local internal roads (in compliance with city codes) with cross connection to all recreation and residential areas. The city's TIA engineer emphasizes the need for the city to be kept abreast of the County's decision, when rendered and the city yielding to Lake County's decision regarding turn lane length for the driveway access permit. The city may consider compliance as a condition of approval.

Michael Rankin introduced the project opened public comment, upon seeing none, public comment was closed. The Special Master found the item met minimum requirements and recommended approval to the City Commission.

STAFF COMMENTS: None

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

This section is reserved for members of the public to bring up matters of concern or opportunities for praise. Note: Pursuant to F.S. 286.0114 and the City of Fruitland Park's Public Participation Policy adopted by Resolution 2013-023, members of the public shall be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard on propositions before the Planning and Zoning Board. Pursuant to Resolution 2013-023, public comments are limited to three minutes.

Sarah McCallum, 2125 Miller Blvd, inquired about the process for establishing a volunteer advisory board, noting that previous meetings with such a board provided greater opportunity for discussion and community input. City staff explained that the City's governing structure is established by ordinance and that any changes to create a volunteer board would require action by the City Commission.

ADJOURNMENT: .7:30 pm.