SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

COUNTY SERVICES BUILDING
1101 EAST FIRST STREET
SANFORD, FLORIDA
32771-1468

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 1, 2026

6:00 PM

BCC Chambers

Planning and Zoning Commission

CALL TO ORDER

Present	Richard Jerman, Carissa Lawhun, Dan Lopez, and Brandy Ioppolo
Absent	Tim Smith, Mike Lorenz, and Lourdes Aguirre

Opening Statement

The meeting convened at 6:00 PM with Chairman Carissa Lawhun leading the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chairman then introduced each Board and Staff member present and read the procedure for conducting the meeting and voting.

Staff Present

Mike Rhodes, Development Services Director,
Dagmarie Segarra, Deputy Development Services Director, Neysa Borkert, Deputy County Attorney, Joe Lofaso, Assistant County Engineer, Joy Giles, Planning Manager, Annie Sillaway, Principal Planner, Kaitlyn Apgar, Senior Planner, and Tammy Brushwood, Clerk to the P&Z Board.

Accept Proof of Publication

Motion by Vice Chairman Brandy Ioppolo, seconded by Commissioner Dan Lopez, to approve the Proof of Publication. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

Aye:	Commissioner Jerman, Commissioner Lawhun, Commissioner Lopez, and Commissioner Ioppolo
Absent:	Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Lorenz, and Commissioner Aguirre

Approval of Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Richard Jerman, seconded by Commissioner Ioppolo, to approve the June 3, 2026 Minutes. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

Aye:	Commissioner Jerman, Commissioner Lawhun, Commissioner Lopez, and Commissioner Ioppolo
Absent:	Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Lorenz, and Commissioner Aguirre

NEW BUSINESS

Public Hearing Items:

1. Tatra Townhomes Rezone - ***REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE TO THE AUGUST 5TH MEETING*** - Consider a Rezone from A-1 (Agriculture) to R-3A (Multiple Family Dwelling) for a seventy (70) unit townhome development on approximately 11.97 acres, located on the west side of Tatra St, north of W Chapman Rd; (Z2025-016) (Chris Leppert, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.) District 1 - Dallari (Kaitlyn Apgar, Senior Planner)

   Kaitlyn Apgar, Senior Planner, stated that the applicant is requesting a continuance of this item. Chairman Carissa Lawhun stated that one public comment card was received and she asked the audience if any member would like to speak that cannot make the next meeting in August. No one responded. The meeting was continued to the August 5, 2026 P&Z meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Richard Jerman, seconded by Commissioner Dan Lopez to Continue the Tatra Townhomes Rezone to the August 5, 2026 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

Aye: Commissioner Jerman, Commissioner Lawhun, Commissioner Lopez, and Commissioner Ioppolo

Absent: Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Lorenz, and Commissioner Aguirre

2. Mission BBQ Special Exception - Consider a Special Exception to allow a restaurant within 1,000 feet of a school to obtain an alcohol license in the PD (Planned Development) district on 0.57 acres, located on the south side of W Lake Mary Boulevard, east of Sun Drive; BS2025-06 (William Leahy, Applicant) District 4 - Lockhart (Kaitlyn Apgar, Senior Planner).

Kaitlyn Apgar, Senior Planner, presented this item as stated in the Staff report. She further stated that the property has a Future Land Use of Commercial and a zoning designation of PD (Planned Development). The restaurant is part of an existing shopping center and is identified in the ETOR PD as Lot 2 of Tract D. The Mission BBQ establishment currently operates an existing bonafide restaurant and requests the Special Exception in order to serve beer and wine for on-site consumption. A bonafide restaurant is considered an establishment where the majority of sales and profit is from the serving of meals and not from the serving of alcoholic beverages, per Seminole County Land Development Code (SCLDC) Sec. 30.6.6.2 (a)(1). Sec. 30.6.6.2(b) of the SCLDC requires that any establishment selling alcoholic beverages for on-premise consumption shall maintain a minimum separation distance of 1,000 feet (air-line measurement) from lot line of the establishment to the nearest lot line of the school. The subject property is approximately 501 feet from the closest school known as the Arbor School of Central Florida, and thus does not meet the 1,000-foot separation, requiring the Special Exception. The proposed development is consistent with the Special Exception criteria as stated in the following slides and Staff report. The subject property is within an established shopping plaza where there are other restaurants and commercial uses of similar nature. The requested Special Exception for an alcohol license is consistent with the commercial nature of the area and is ancillary to the property's function as a restaurant. Considering the property is within a shopping plaza, traffic patterns and calculations have already been accounted for to support the commercial use. The site gains access via the internal drive aisle that connects to Sun Drive, thus reducing any curb cuts onto a main arterial. Adequate parking meeting SCLDC standards is currently being provided on-site. The existing restaurant is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in that the Commercial Future Land Use allows for a variety of commercial establishments intended to be located along major roadways. Lake Mary Boulevard is a principal arterial roadway, therefore the restaurant meets this intent. Within this planned shopping center and along the W Lake Mary Boulevard corridor exists numerous restaurants that serve alcohol. The subject property is not in proximity to residentially developed areas. This area is considered a major commercial node and the ancillary serving of alcohol by a bonafide restaurant is considered customary in practice. In compliance with Seminole County Land

Development Code, the Applicant conducted a community meeting on May 1, 2026. Details of the community meeting have been provided in the agenda package.

Staff requests the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend the Board of County Commissioners approve the Special Exception and associated Development Order, per the following motion:

Based on Staff's findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds the request meets the identified portions of the Land Development Code and recommends the Board of County Commissioners approve the Special Exception and associated Development Order to allow, with conditions, a restaurant within 1,000 feet of a school to obtain an alcohol license in the PD (Planned Development) district on 0.57 acres, located on the south side of W Lake Mary Boulevard, east of Sun Drive.

Commissioner Richard Jerman addressed Staff that he was disappointed that (courtesy) notices were sent to everybody based on the required Code distances, but they didn't notify either one of the schools and he asked why they didn't. Commissioner Jerman further stated that he guesses the schools are far enough back that they didn't make the list. He asked if we heard from any of the schools, and Ms. Apgar responded that she had not.

Deborah Maine, for the applicant, of Lake Mary, Florida, stated that she is representing Mission BBQ. She further stated that based on their other Mission BBQ locations, the sale of alcohol is less than 1% of their sales. They are trying to compete with the surrounding restaurants who offer beer and wine with a meal.

No one from the audience spoke in favor or in opposition to this request.

Public comment was closed.

Based on Staff's findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds the request meets the identified portions of the Land Development Code and recommends the Board of County Commissioners approve the Special Exception and associated Development Order to allow, with conditions, a restaurant within 1,000 feet of a school to obtain an alcohol license in the PD (Planned Development) district on 0.57 acres, located on the south side of W Lake Mary Boulevard, east of Sun Drive.

Motion by Vice Chairman Brandy Ioppolo, seconded by Commissioner Dan Lopez, to approve the Mission BBQ Special Exception. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

Aye: Commissioner Jerman, Commissioner Lawhun, Commissioner Lopez, and Commissioner Ioppolo

Absent: Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Lorenz, and Commissioner Aguirre

3. Kentucky Street Special Exception - Request for a Special Exception for a proposed

143-foot communication tower and four (4) variances to the required separation distance from properties with existing single family use, located on the north side of Kentucky Street, approximately 1,700 feet east of Skyway Drive; Z2025-15 (Mary Doty Solik, Applicant) District 5 - Herr (Annie Sillaway, Principal Planner).

Annie Sillaway, Principal Planner, presented this item as stated in the Staff report. She further stated that the request has been evaluated in accordance with the provisions of the Seminole County Land Development Code including;

1. Section 30.6.7, which establishes performance standards for communication towers including setbacks and separation from uses between towers and height;
2. Section 30.3.1.5(a), which establishes the Special Exception criteria, applicable additional use standards and the A-1 criteria;
3. Section 30.6.7.3(b), Table 1, which establishes the variances criteria for communication towers, including aesthetic impacts, compatibility with abutting properties, additional provisions per section 30.6.7.1(b);
4. Consideration of Section 30.43(3), which establishes the standard variance criteria applicable to all variance requests.

The Applicant is requesting approval of a Special Exception to construct a 143-foot monopole communication tower designed to accommodate up to three wireless carriers. The property has a Future Land Use designation of Higher Intensity Planned Development-Airport and is zoned A-1 (Agriculture). The subject property is approximately 1.67 acres meeting the minimum required lot size and lot width of the A-1 zoning district. The Applicant proposes to place the communication tower in the northeast corner of the vacant site. A Special Exception is required for communication towers within the A-1 zoning district. The Special Exception request shall be evaluated for compliance with all applicable sections of the Seminole County Land Development Code (SCLDC). Pursuant to Sec. 30.6.7.3, communication towers must maintain a minimum separation distance (from existing single family residential uses) of 200 feet or 300% of the height of the tower, whichever is greater, unless a variance is granted. Such variance may be approved upon findings that the proposed tower minimizes aesthetic impacts and remains compatible with surrounding properties. The proposed tower height is 143 feet, which requires a separation distance of 429 feet. Four (4) variances are being requested from the required separation distance of 429 feet, measured from the outer extremity of the base of the communication tower to the property line of the parcel that has an existing single-family residential use. The tower is proposed to be located approximately 111 feet from the nearest property line of a residential use. The remaining three (3) residential parcels are located at a distance of 141 feet, 307 feet, and 308 feet from the base of the proposed communication tower. The applicant has obtained consent from all affected property owners for the reduced separation distance. The Board of County Commissioners may approve the request if it is determined that the use requested meets the Special Exception criteria. The proposed 143-foot monopole communication tower would negatively impact the character of the surrounding residential area with its encroachment intensified by the minimum separation distance of only 111 feet from the nearest residential property line. While the tower would generate de minimis traffic and telecommunications facilities are allowed within the HIP-AP Future Land Use designation, its proximity to nearby residences creates adverse effects despite its passive nature and limited noise.

Although the tower meets the A-1 zoning district's required side and rear setbacks, it does not meet the required 429-foot separation from four adjacent residential properties.

The subject property and surrounding parcels are zoned A-1, but the HIP-AP Future Land Use designation signals a long-term transition away from agriculture toward airport compatible development. As this area grows, new uses will align with that direction rather than agricultural activity.

Staff evaluated the request against the six (6) required variance criteria as follows:

1) While the proximity of the surrounding residential properties limits tower placement on the site, Staff does not find these conditions to be unique or substantially different from other similarly zoned properties;

2) Staff finds the need for the variance results from the Applicant's decision to locate the tower on a site that cannot meet the required residential separation distance;

3) Staff finds the approval would not confer a special privilege, because the variance process is available to all similarly situated properties under the same standards;

4) Staff finds the strict application of the Land Development Code would not deprive the property of rights commonly enjoyed by other A-1 properties, as the site retains all permitted uses within the zoning district, and the Applicant is responsible for demonstrating unnecessary hardship;

5) While the Applicant has located the tower in the northeastern portion of the property to maximize separation from nearby residences and has obtained letters of support from the affected property owners, Staff finds the property retains reasonable use without the variance;

6) Staff finds the request is not in harmony with the intent and purpose of Chapter 30, because it substantially reduces the required residential separation distance established to protect compatibility and minimize visual impacts. Although the proposal includes a monopole design and an eight-foot opaque fence, Staff finds these mitigation measures are not proportional to the magnitude of the requested reduction and does not support approval of the variance.

Staff finds that the proposed communication tower generally satisfies the Special Exception criteria of Section 30.3.1.5, however, the requested variance would substantially reduce the required 429-foot residential separation distance, undermining the compatibility and visual protections established by the Land Development Code and proposed mitigation measures do not adequately offset the magnitude of the requested reduction. Staff recommends denial of the requested variances and the associated Special Exception. If the Board chooses to proceed with the approval of the variance request, Staff requests that the Planning and Zoning Commission approve and refer the Special Exception to the Board of County Commissioners as per the following motion:

Based on Staff findings and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds the proposed Special Exception is not detrimental to the character of the area and will not adversely impact the public interest with the inclusion of the following Special Exception conditions:

1) *The proposed communication tower is to be designed as a monopole and will not exceed 143 feet, including antennas and lightning rod.*
2) *Any improvements and/or additions to the proposed tower shall be submitted for approval to the County.*
3) *No signage or advertising shall be permitted on the proposed tower, unless otherwise required by law.*
4) *The proposed tower shall not be artificially lit, except to ensure human safety, or as required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), which the Applicant is providing for the Orlando-Sanford Airport.*
5) *Prior to the issuance of Building permits, the Applicant shall obtain approval of a site plan that meets all other applicable Code requirements, including Chapter 40 of the Land Development Code, from the Development Review Committee (DRC).*
6) *Any Special Exception granted shall expire one (1) year after approval unless a development permit, based upon and incorporating the Special Exception, is obtained within the one (1) year period. One six (6) month extension may be granted by the Board of County Commissioners (SCLDC 30.3.6).*

The Applicant conducted a community meeting on April 8, 2026 and the details are included in the Board's agenda package.

Staff requests that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend that the Board of County Commissioners *deny* the requested variance due to the required separation distance between the proposed communication tower and existing residential development. Because the Special Exception is contingent upon approval of the variance, Staff cannot support the Special Exception, unless the associated variances are granted. Therefore, Staff recommends the following motion:

Based on Staff's findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the requested variances do not satisfy the applicable criteria of the Seminole County Land Development Code, as presented by Staff, and recommends denial of the requested variances. Because approval of the Special Exception is contingent upon approval of the variances, the Planning and Zoning Commission further recommends denial of the Special Exception.

Neysa Borkert, Deputy County Attorney, made a clarification from the slide presented, that if the Board decides to approve the request, the slide shown are the conditions that Staff would suggest be associated with the approval. Those conditions can be found in the agenda packet on page 88 of the Development Order.

Mary Doty Solik, for the applicant, of Orlando, Florida, stated that she is legal counsel for C4 Towers, who is the tower developer in this application. Tim O'Shaughnessy is the Principal of C4 Towers and is also in the auditorium tonight. Ms. Solik provided a background on the location using a map shown on the overhead screen, cited property owned by the City of Sanford, surrounded on the north and east and stated it is intended for utility uses. She further stated the area is already sort of an industrial use affecting this particular neighborhood. They pushed the tower location to the northeast corner of the property in order to move it as far away from the residents as possible. It is a 139 foot tower with a 4 foot lightning rod, which makes it a total height of 143 feet. Multiply that by 300%, and that gives the setback of 429 feet. They have FAA approval for a 155 foot tower, but if they did that they would increase the variance length on the four (4) properties to the east and southwest, which then they wouldn't meet the variance to the residential structure on this property. She advised her client to lower the height in order to minimize the variances; at least to not have to need one from the residential property (shown on the screen). It is a 70' by 70' leased area, 60' by 60' compound. The tower has a 38' fall zone radius, in the unlikely event of a tower failure. The access comes off of Kentucky Street and runs along the southern boundary of the property and to the eastern property line. This is an area that is zoned Agriculture with some residential structures in that location. There is an underlying High Intensity Airport Future Land Use, which means that this area will be in transition. The Agricultural zoning is really more like a holding pattern. An elevation drawing of the tower was provided, with three (3) co-locators at 139' feet made of steel, which is about the most that can go on the tower. There are only three (3) licensed carriers left in the marketplace, with a T-Mobile anchored tower. There will be space on the tower available for AT&T and Verizon as their needs and budgets allow. They anticipate that all three (3) carriers will end up on this pole. There will be an 8' opaque fence at the bottom, with landscaping around the compound, and they meet all of the performance criteria related to fencing, landscaping, property line, and setbacks. She read the SCLDC Section 30.6.7.3(b)(3), regarding separation distances that may be reduced by the Planning Manager when written consent as set forth in a recordable instrument is obtained from all property owners within the applicable separation distance. She further stated that there are four (4) properties that have a residential structure on them that are within the applicable setback distance. These properties submitted notarized written approval consent forms for the project, however the Planning Manager refused to reduce the separations. She stated that only one of the four properties has a homestead exemption. The other properties are owned by investors, LLCs, or corporations, and not family homesteaded. She further stated that the Code requires the setback from the outer base of the tower to the property line on which the residential structure is located. Their engineer measured the actual distance from the base of the tower to the actual structure on each of the properties. Most of the properties are long and irregularly shaped properties and because of that there are different numbers that can be calculated. When Staff states that they don't support the variance because they don't meet the intent of the Code, the visual impact buffer to the structures, there are unique circumstances that demonstrates on three of the four properties that the distance between the tower and the structure exceeds the 429'. There really is buffering there and they have met the intent of the Code when it comes to the buffering and separation between the tower and the structure itself. None of these structures face the tower, rather they face Jesup or Kentucky. They would argue that they have met the intent of the Code and that there are unique circumstances given the layout of the properties and locations of the homes that demonstrate they are meeting the setbacks. Also, every single one of the property owners have okayed the project and signed notarized written consent for the project. There are not many choices (for cell towers) in the area. They cannot provide service to the area and meet a setback anywhere else due to the dense residential nature of the area. Ms. Solik stated that they do meet the variance criteria and cited each condition and in summary have satisfied the intent of the Code along with the affected properties consent.

No one spoke in favor of this request.

The following persons *spoke in opposition* to this request:

1. Ravichandra Sathari, of Sanford, stated that they live just south of the proposed proje in River Run Preserve, which is a dense community. Their opposition includes Staff's detailed reasons provided, how it (adversely) affects the value of their property, and they don't want to see the tower from their property.

2. Raghu Kundurthi, of Sanford, lives southwest of this property. He stated that he come from a telecommunications background. The type of the wavelength provided by these providers is important and why none of the cities in the country would ever allow an urban area or close to an urban area that is densely populated, like this area, to be picked as a site for a cell tower. Also, all of the wireless providers are to have towers completely camouflaged and decorated with canopies. (*remainder of comments inaudible*)

Opposition to this request was received *in writing* from the following:

1. Kiran Kumar Sankaramanchi of Sanford
2. Ravichandra Sathari Mallikarjuna, of Sanford
3. Ravichandra Pasala, of Sanford
4. Ranpraddeep Nallain *(spelling illegible)*
5. Purna Naga Mallika Nagamothu, of Sanford
6. Bala Sankar, of Sanford
7. Praveen Kumar Nukala, of Sanford
8. Tanmeeya Seh *(name not legible*), of Sanford

Public comment was closed.

Mary Doty Solik, in her rebuttal, stated the following:

The cell tower generates very little traffic once it is constructed; one vehicle trip per quarter, per carrier to inspect the tower in a light duty vehicle. The High Intensity Airport Future Land use of that area will generate far more traffic in the future than the cell tower ever will. A dense area is what drives the need for the cell tower. These (towers) need to be where the people are for cell coverage available to the people who live there. She did some more measurements and the first row of homes south of Kentucky Street is over 650' away from the tower and therefore meets the residential separation requirement from the tower. That setback is the means for addressing visual impact, which they far exceed from the residents to the south.

Tim O'Shaughnessy, for the applicant, of Orlando, FL, stated that there is a real coverage need in this area. He spent a long time looking for the right property for the cell tower. He is from Seminole County and went to school here. He cares about the people in this neighborhood. He spoke to the neighbors in the area and this is the best he could find for the tower property location to fill the need for the area.

Commissioner Richard Jerman asked Staff what the underlying land use is to the east of this property in Sanford.

Dagmarie Segarra, Deputy Development Services Director, responded that the Future Land Use for Sanford is Airport Industrial and Commerce. This property is also included in the small area study that the County did a few years ago, which was designated as a mixed use area.

Commissioner Jerman stated that there was approval from the four impacted property owners, and he is concerned that there is a demand for towers, however, he doesn't want to set a precedent. The distance provided by the applicant is quite a bit of a distance, but looking from the property line, which is what the Code says, it's approximately a 75% variance. He is worried about the precedent they set, as the need is big for more towers. He isn't quite sure what to do and would like the Board's input.

Vice Chairman Brandy Ioppolo stated she feels the same, and agrees with Mr. Jerman's comments. She tries to put herself in the situation whether she's a homeowner or a tenant, and she doesn't want to look at a tower, even though they are trying to make it look nicer.

Commissioner Dan Lopez commented that the purpose of a Special Exception is because the request doesn't meet the Code. In his opinion, as long as the people who are directly affected aren't opposed to it then the variance contributes to the community. The benefits outweigh the concerns for establishing a precedent. He supports the project.

Vice Chairman Ioppolo stated that she knows we need more cell towers with the growing population, but thinks there is another location for it.

Based on Staff's findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the requested variances do not satisfy the applicable criteria of the Seminole County Land Development Code, as presented by Staff, and recommends denial of the requested variances. Because approval of the Special Exception is contingent upon approval of the variances, the Planning and Zoning Commission further recommends denial of the Special Exception.

Motion by Vice Chairman Ioppolo, seconded by Commissioner Richard Jerman, to deny the Kentucky Street Special Exception. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: Commissioner Jerman, Commissioner Lawhun, and Commissioner Ioppolo

Nay: Commissioner Lopez

Absent: Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Lorenz, and Commissioner Aguirre

4. Isola Retail PD Major Amendment Rezone - Consider a Rezone from PD (Planned Development) to PD (Planned Development) to allow outdoor storage in conjunction with Building 2 only, as shown on the Master Development Plan, within the Isola Retail PD, on approximately 3.25 acres, located on the west side of Longwood Lake Mary Rd, 300 feet north of Ronald Reagan Blvd; (Z2026-04) (Robert Isola, Applicant) District4 - Lockhart (Annie Sillaway, Principal Planner)

Annie Sillaway, Principal Planner, presented this item as stated in the Staff report. She further stated that the Applicant is requesting a rezone from PD (Planned Development) to PD (Planned Development) to allow outdoor storage exclusively to Building 2 within the Isola Retail PD. The subject property has an Industrial Future Land Use designation, which allows a maximum intensity of 0.65 Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.). The intent of the Industrial Future Land Use designation is to provide appropriate locations for a variety of heavy commercial and industrial uses oriented toward wholesale distribution, storage, manufacturing, and other industrial uses. On February 8, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners approved the Isola Retail PD, permitting C-3 (Heavy Commercial and Very Light Industrial) uses while prohibiting certain uses, including, but not limited to, marine sales and service, mechanical garages, and outdoor storage. The Applicant is requesting approval to include the use of outdoor storage on the developed site, limited to the southwest portion of the development and restricted to the tenant occupying Building 2. The proposed outdoor storage area will not impede or adversely affect on-site traffic circulation within the existing developed site with access coming off of Longwood Lake Mary Road. An existing dumpster enclosure is located within the proposed outdoor storage area and will remain in place. The Applicant has provided a letter of acceptance from Waste Pro confirming that the proposed additional fencing around the storage area is acceptable, provided that adequate access to the dumpster enclosure is maintained for service and collection operations to ensure uninterrupted service. Waste Pro has identified the conditions for continued service, which includes:

1. the dumpster enclosure and surrounding storage area must maintain adequate maneuvering and access space for service vehicles during scheduled collection times;

2. a gate combination, lock code, or other approved access methods must be provided for the exterior gate to allow drivers access to the dumpster enclosure for servicing, as necessary; and

3. the proposed outdoor storage will not add any impervious area; therefore, the applicant is not required to modify the existing storm water pond.

The existing development meets the review criteria for the PD. The PD zoning is consistent with the Industrial Future Land Use and such that C-3, permitted within the Isola Retail PD, typically allows outdoor storage of parts, supplies, and materials within an enclosed or fenced area. The Applicant is exceeding the arbor requirements of the Code by proposing to install three (3) southern magnolia trees, each with a minimum three inch (3”) caliper and a minimum height of ten feet (10’), around the outdoor storage area. Also, they will provide five (5) bicycle parking spaces near the front of the site to accommodate customers and employees who use bicycles for transportation. The Applicant meets Sec. 30.8.5.3 (d) (1-4) of the Planned Development Criteria. The proposed Planned Development zoning classification is compatible with the surrounding industrial development and is consistent with the allowable use and intensity provisions of the Industrial Future Land Use designation, that includes adequate buffering, an opaque fence, to provide visual screening from Longwood Lake Mary Rd and adjacent properties. Staff finds the requested PD zoning classification to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Applicant conducted a community meeting on April 27, 2026 with details of the community meeting provided in the Board’s agenda package. The Isola Retail PD Major Amendment Rezone is proposed to be heard on August 11, 2026 by the Board of County Commissioners.

Staff requests the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Ordinance enacting a Rezone from PD (Planned Development) to PD (Planned Development) as per the following motion:

Based on Staff’s findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds the request meets the identified portions of the Seminole County Land Development Code and recommends the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Ordinance enacting a rezone from PD (Planned Development) to PD (Planned Development), and approve the associated Addendum #1 to the Development Order and Master Development Plan, on approximately 3.25 acres, located on the west side of Longwood Lake Mary Rd, 300 feet north of Ronald Reagan Blvd.

John Frith, for the applicant, of Frith and Associates, is the engineer for the project. They concur with Staff’s notes and approval. He and the owner, Bob Izollo, are available if there are any questions by the Board.

No one from the audience spoke in favor or in opposition to this request.

Public comment was closed.

Based on Staff’s findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds the request meets the identified portions of the Seminole County Land Development Code and recommends the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Ordinance enacting a rezone from PD (Planned Development) to PD (Planned Development), and approve the associated Addendum #1 to the Development Order and Master Development Plan, on approximately 3.25 acres, located on the west side of Longwood Lake Mary Rd, 300 feet north of Ronald Reagan Blvd.

Motion by Vice Chairman Ioppolo, seconded by Commissioner Dan Lopez, to approve the Isola Retail PD Major Amendment Rezone. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

Aye: Commissioner Jerman, Commissioner Lawhun, Commissioner Lopez, and Commissioner Ioppolo

Absent: Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Lorenz, and Commissioner Aguirre

5. Sanford Commerce Center Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment and PD Major Amendment Rezone - Consider a Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment from Commercial to Industrial and a Rezone from PD (Planned Development) to PD (Planned Development) for a proposed 144,000 square foot commercial and industrial flex space warehouse development on approximately 17.23 acres, located on the south side of Orange Blvd, and approximately ½ mile east of Oregon St; (Z2026-06/02.26SS.01) (S. Brent Spain, Esquire, Applicant) District 5 - Herr (Annie Sillaway, Principal Planner)

Annie Sillaway, Principal Planner, presented this item as stated in the Staff report. She further stated that on November 15, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners approved a request for a Small Scale Future Land Use Amendment from Commercial to Industrial on approximately 9.9 acres, along with a Rezone from A-1 (Agriculture) to PD (Planned Development) on approximately 22.3 acres, known as the Orange Boulevard PD. The purpose of the request was to allow commercial uses permitted under the C-1 (Retail Commercial) and C-2 (General Commercial) zoning districts on Lots 1-4, and to allow industrial uses permitted under the C-3 (Heavy Commercial and Very Light Industrial), and M-1A (Very Light Industrial) zoning districts only on Lots 2 and 3. In 2024, Lot 1 was removed from the PD, reducing the acreage from 22.3 acres to 17.23 acres and was re-platted to combine Lots 2-4 into Lot 2. The purpose of this land use amendment and rezone is to allow those C-3 and M-1A uses throughout the entire PD on Lot 2 instead of restricting those uses to a designated area. The Applicant is retaining the original entitlements previously approved by the Board, including but not limited to: a maximum Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) of 0.65; a maximum building height of thirty-five (35) feet; and a building setback of one-hundred feet (100’) for a two-story building, and a one-hundred fifty feet (150’) setback for a three-story building along the west perimeter adjacent to the residential Bookertown neighborhood. The previously established prohibited uses also remains in effect, including mechanical garages, lumber yards, construction companies with outdoor storage, highway striping companies, paint and body shops, office showrooms without assembly or manufacturing, and service stations with gas pumps as an accessory use, and communication towers. The Applicant is also maintaining the existing twenty-five-foot (25') landscape buffer along the western portion of the site to preserve the established buffer. In addition to retaining these entitlements, the Applicant is proposing three (3) modifications to the PD:

1. Vacating the western seventy-foot (70') platted access, drainage, and utility easement to allow expansion of the proposed flex-space warehouse building, which would otherwise encroach into a portion of that easement; and

2. Amending the Future Land Use designation on the portion of land previously known as Lot 4 of the Orange Boulevard PD, from Commercial to Industrial and adding permitted uses consistent with the C-3 and M-1A zoning district; and 1.

3. Increasing the west perimeter building setback from the previous fifty (50) feet to sixty (60) feet for a one-story building.

The Applicant is also requesting a parking reduction as follows:

Per the Seminole County Land Development Code

- Manufacturing Concerns and Warehouses: with one (1) space per two (2) employees, plus one (1) space for a company vehicle; and

- General Business/Retail/Office: The first 10,000 sq. ft. is four (4) spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. and above 10,000 sq. ft. are three (3) spaces per 1,000 sq. ft.

Per the Applicants proposal:

- For Warehouses: 0.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet
- For General Business/Retail/Office: 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Due to the allowable mix of uses onsite, Staff does not support the parking reduction as proposed by the Applicant and recommends the following:

Staff proposes: a minimum parking ratio of two (2) parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. This recommendation reflects the wide range of permitted uses proposed within the Sanford Commerce PD. Because these uses vary in intensity, staff determined that a consistent minimum parking ratio of two (2) spaces per 1,000 square feet is appropriate and can be reasonably met by all permitted uses within the district.

Access to the subject site is proposed through Lot 1 to the north, which connects to Orange Blvd, an urban major collector road. Orange Blvd currently operates at a level of service A or B, depending on direction and time of day, and has programmed improvements in the County's five year Capital Improvements Program. The developer will be required to construct a sidewalk extending to the north boundary line of the subject site, allow the future developer of Lot 1 (adjacent to the north) to complete the remaining sidewalk segment and connect it to the existing sidewalk along Orange Blvd. The Applicant has met the PD Review criteria for the requested Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment and PD Major Amendment, allowing C-3 and M-1A uses consistent with the Seminole County Comprehensive Plan. Although residential uses lie to the west, the north and east are established with industrial development, reflecting the area’s broader pattern of Heavy Commercial and Industrial uses. The PD sets limits on F.A.R., uses, setbacks, buffers, and height, and the Applicant provides added benefits including CPTED features, an innovative flex-space warehouse supporting economic development, and a substantial west-side buffer adjacent to the neighborhood. The project meets the Arbor Code requirements and adds internal pedestrian and bicycle connections to Orange Blvd. The subject property does not have existing trees on site; however, the developer proposes to plant a substantial buffer along the west perimeter of the development adjacent to the existing residential neighborhood. As an infill project, the proposed development is consistent with the Central Florida Regional Growth Vision. It also supports Policy TRA 2.4.3, which promotes infill development to maximize the efficient use of the existing transportation network within urban areas. Additionally, the project is consistent with Policy FLU 5.4.6, which encourages employment and industrial uses adjacent to residential areas, provided compatibility is maintained. To ensure compatibility with the adjacent Bookertown neighborhood, the Applicant will provide a 25-foot landscape buffer and an increased building setback of at least 60 feet along the western portion of the site. Staff finds the proposed Industrial Future Land Use designation and PD zoning classification consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Applicant had a community meeting on May 14, 2026 and the details have been included in the Board's agenda package. This item is scheduled to be heard at the August 11, 2026 Board of County Commissioner's meeting.

Staff requests the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend the Board of County Commissioners adopt an Ordinance enacting a Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment and concurrent Rezoning Ordinance per the following two motions:

Based on Staff's findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds the request meets the identified portions of the Comprehensive Plan and recommends the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Ordinance enacting a Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment from Commercial to Industrial.

Based on Staff's findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds the request meets the identified portions of the Seminole County Land Development Code and recommends the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Ordinance enacting a rezone from PD (Planned Development) to PD (Planned Development), and approve the associated Development Order and Master Development Plan on approximately 17.23 acres, located on the south side of Orange Blvd, approximately ½ mile east of Oregon St.

Drew Thigpen, for the applicant, with Pelican Industrial, in Charlotte, NC, presented this item. He is one of four owners and founders of Pelican Industrial. This is a $30M total cost to deliver from project design through occupancy. They estimate it will generate $250K annually in new tax revenue. They are committed to deliver this project in a single phase in under one year. This is a job creating product for Seminole County. Their company focuses on a hybrid project called shallow bay, light industrial, commercial service, or flex space; which this project straddles shallow bay/warehouse and single story suburban office. Mr. Thigpen continued with his presentation on the appearance of the buildings, and showed the exhibits and slide presentation on the overhead. He stated that they build all of their projects without knowing who will lease. The outward facing exterior will be an office appearance, along Orange Boulevard and I-4. The adjacent Bookertown neighborhood will not be able to view the loading activities, as they oriented the buildings perpendicular to the neighborhood, with a 25' landscape buffer and 10' screening walls between them. The four (4) storm water ponds have already been constructed and approved by St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD), which they tie into. They are a three lot site with two (2) of the lots allowing for C-3 and M-1A uses, with their desire to make one comprehensive plot that has all of these shared uses. They will work within their site plan layout to increase the minimum current 50' building setback to the west, up to 60', by adding an additional 10' buffer away from the neighborhood. One item they weren't able to get consensus on with Staff was the parking. Staff requested they provide two spaces per 1,000 square feet. They think what they've provided is already significantly over-parked for their proposed tenants, which they weren't able to accommodate, which is 280+ required spaces. Their tenants typically have 75% of the space as warehouse with 25% office. Their traffic engineer analyzed this site and determined the required parking is 167 spaces compared with the 161 spaces calculated. They are confident they will have more than enough parking. They request the Board's support for the parking reduction. They are just shy of the 144,000 sf, which is142,800 sf. In summary, they are focusing on supporting local service space tenants by investing $30M to create $250k per year in tax revenue for the County.

No one from the audience spoke in favor or in opposition to this request. Public comment was closed.

Vice Chairman Brandy Ioppolo asked Staff about the minimum parking requirements of two (2) spaces, as it doesn't mention in the request about the change of the parking spaces. Neysa Borkert, Deputy County Attorney, responded that Staff is putting forth their motion, which is based on the Development Order containing what the Code requires for parking, which is two (2) spaces per 1,000'. If the Board wants to approve this item, but instead chooses to use the applicant's methodology for parking, than the Board would need to be include that language into the motion. Otherwise, it would remain per Staff's request with the two (2) parking spaces per 1,000 sf, as presented by Staff.

Commissioner Richard Jerman asked Staff if they looked at their other projects with how many parking spaces they've used in similar flex space projects and Staff responded they did not. Mr. Jerman commented that what the applicant proposed could be more than adequate based on their experience in flex space use in other locales. Deputy Development Services Director, Dagmarie Segarra, responded that we did not specifically look at their projects, but based on previous experience and data when development in a flex space combines uses from C-1 to Industrial, they find that market driven retail uses, such as daycares, gyms, and churches, is what we see in this area. Staff's concerns are that if those types of C-1 uses are also allowed in this PD, there could be a problem with parking. Mr. Jerman stated that if there aren't enough parking spaces then people won't lease the space. He asked if any suggestions were made by Staff to the applicant on how they could provide the additional parking spaces on the site plan. Ms. Segarra responded that their recommendation is for the ratio proposed and Staff did not agree with what the applicant proposed. She further stated that it is hard to determine and agrees that there typically is 25% office space on this type of development, with mostly the C-1 uses being general retail, of which could have a greater impact, or 10-20% of the total square footage of the development. The middle ground arrived at was based on what the Code requires and what the applicant proposes. The office space in the applicant's experience is 25% office and 75% industrial.

Mr. Thigpen stated that everything Dagmarie stated is totally correct. One thing that is unique about their product, especially from a parking standpoint, is if a church comes to the site, that could change the 75% warehouse and 25% office to be the opposite. Their need for the rear-loading space, which is 170' between buildings, would then be eliminated and strip the "rear-loading" space if additional parking was needed. They rarely have to do it, but it is a significant amount of paved, readily available parking that they can grab and use if needed. The 0.5 F.A.R. that was mentioned, they are 0.2 F.A.R., so the only way to make more parking work is to add more square footage. Their proposal is the least impactful way that they can make this project work.

Commissioner Dan Lopez asked if they do have a tenant who needs to add more parking, what is their estimate on the number they could add on any of the overflow loading areas. Mr. Thigpen responded approximately eight (8) in the loading area, which would be 130 additional parking spaces, with no parking in an interior spine road, maxed out between buildings two and three, that would be another 50 parking spaces. They are heavily focused on this being a warehouse heavy product. What they don't want to see is the creep of starting with 20% office and then 30%, then 100% office, which no one in the real estate world wants right now. Mr. Lopez stated that 10-15 years down the line, the future tenants may change. There is a significant different with over a 100 parking spots between what the Code states and their proposal.

Vice Chairman Ioppolo stated that she agreed and they don't know the mix of office versus industrial uses right now. If they have the opportunity to make additional parking spaces, why don't they stripe it now so it isn't an issue. Mr. Thigpen responded that they expect loading operations there, and not parking. He offered to add a project-wide office use "cannot exceed a 50% cap", then if the world changes with another use, the established cap will be there. They could also put together a proposed striping plan to meet the threshold.

Chairman Carissa Lawhun stated that she heard the concern for parking to be more related to C-1 uses. Dagmarie Segarra responded that was correct and the C-1 uses are already entitled from the existing PD. It was their recommendation to limit the retail uses.

Mr. Thigpen stated when they say office, he is focusing on the actual build-out, or the footprint of office, so if 50% of the space was office with cubicles, bathrooms, and a kitchen for C-1 or C-2, that is the amount of space that they will need for parking and what they've seen happen in other places. As mentioned, with a cap on the actual amount of office space, since that's largely what dictates the parking need.

Commissioner Jerman stated that he thinks Staff was a little heavy handed on what they asked for, but at the same time, he thinks the applicant is a little light. He further asked the applicant if they could commit to a minimum of 200 spaces. Mr. Thigpen responded that if they would stripe them in a proposed loading court stripe plan, he would be okay with that. They can't accommodate anything more from a dedicated parking only standpoint. They could show it from an overflow parking standpoint, and which are totally accessible for pedestrian access in the building's rear. Some people have made these buildings entirely office and they'll take out the rear load door and put in windows, so it's totally doable. There are a lot of overhead power lines that bracket this site and limited with how it can be laid out. They can do a proposed augmented parking plan that shows where they can stripe the loading to get to a higher number of parking spaces.

Further discussion ensued regarding the parking plan.

Dagmarie Segarra proposed a recommendation for the Board, providing the applicant agrees, to make a motion to approve the project as proposed to include that Staff will continue to work with the applicant to determine the uses and maybe limiting more of the uses from the retail side, in order to find a happy medium to be completed by and before the BCC hearing. The applicant responded that they would support that option.

Motion by Commissioner Dan Lopez, seconded by Vice Chairman Brandy Ioppolo, to approve the Sanford Commerce Center Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment and PD Major Amendment Rezone, with the condition that Staff and the applicant will continue working together to determine the appropriate number of parking spaces, per Staff's recommendation. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

Aye:	Commissioner Jerman, Commissioner Lawhun, Commissioner Lopez, and Commissioner Ioppolo
Absent:	Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Lorenz, and Commissioner Aguirre

CLOSING BUSINESS

Director's Report

Development Services Director's Report - Dagmarie Segarra stated the Land Development Code update will be heard for the second reading by the Board of County Commissioners on July 14, 2026. Staff will move to the next round of amendments for the Comprehensive Plan and Legislative updates.

Board Comments

Commissioner Richard Jerman stated that he is a little upset with the Mission BBQ project that Staff didn't reach out to the two affected parties, which are the two schools. He thinks Staff should do that before the BCC hearing. Ms. Segarra responded that they weren't notified because they aren't within the buffer. Neysa Borkert stated that the mailing notification isn't the only notification as the property is also posted.

ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM.