

Opposition to Case LUP-26-01-014, Stonemont Manor Land Use Plan (Tangerine Rural Settlement)

From: Dr. Daniel Thomas (drthomas123@yahoo.com)

To: allison.rice@ocfl.net

Cc: mayor@ocfl.net; district1@ocfl.net; district2@ocfl.net; district3@ocfl.net; district4@ocfl.net; district5@ocfl.net; district6@ocfl.net

Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2026 at 09:49 AM EDT

Dear Ms. Rice,

I am a resident of the Tangerine Rural Settlement, and I am writing to formally oppose the Stonemont Manor Land Use Plan (Case LUP-26-01-014), which seeks to rezone approximately 38.86 acres at 6322 Terrell Road and 6409 N. Orange Blossom Trail from A-1 (Citrus Rural District) to PD (Planned Development) for up to 38 single-family homes on lots as small as 0.33 acres. I respectfully ask that this email be included in the official case record and forwarded to Commissioner Crabb, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the Board of County Commissioners.

This proposal is not consistent with the character, intent, or policies that govern our community. My objections are as follows.

- 1. It conflicts with the County's express commitment to preserve Tangerine's character.** Future Land Use Policy FLU6.2.2 identifies Tangerine as one of only five Rural Settlements recognized for maintaining their historic character, and directs that every effort be made to preserve that character as part of Orange County's heritage. A tract subdivision of 38 homes on one-third-acre lots is suburban development, not rural development. It is the opposite of the preservation the Comprehensive Plan promises this community.
- 2. The 38-unit figure appears to be based on gross acreage, not net density.** The Rural Settlement 1/1 designation allows a maximum of one dwelling unit per net acre. Net developable area excludes wetlands, water bodies, required open space, stormwater facilities, and road right-of-way. The community meeting notice states that the site is limited to 38 units, which matches the gross acreage almost exactly. Before making any recommendation, I ask that staff publish a full net developable acreage calculation. If the net area is less than 38 acres, the proposal exceeds the density permitted by the land use designation and should not proceed as submitted.
- 3. The small lots depend on urban-style utilities that should not be extended into a Rural Settlement.** Under the County's cluster provisions, lots as small as one-third acre are generally only possible where central water is provided. Rural Settlements lie within the Rural Service Area, and Policy FLU6.2.15 provides that existing utility capacity shall not be used as a reason for increased densities within a Rural Settlement. Extending central utilities to enable one-third-acre lots here would set a precedent that invites the same pattern on every remaining undeveloped parcel in Tangerine. To the extent the property lies within the Wekiva Study Area, the added stormwater and wastewater concerns make this even more serious.
- 4. The lot sizes are incompatible with the surrounding properties.** The homes and parcels surrounding this site are predominantly one acre or larger. Lots roughly one-third that size, placed directly against established rural homesteads, are not a compatible transition. Clustering is meant to

preserve rural character through open space and thoughtful layout, not to justify a conventional subdivision footprint inside a protected rural community.

5. Terrell Road and the surrounding rural roads are not designed for this traffic. Terrell Road is a narrow rural road serving residents, agricultural uses, pedestrians, and cyclists. Traffic from 38 new households, plus construction traffic, would materially change the safety and character of this corridor and its intersections with Wadsworth Road and N. Orange Blossom Trail. No traffic analysis has been made available to residents.\

6. Proximity to Stoneybrook Hills does not justify suburban density. The site's location next to a master-planned community is not a reason to extend that pattern into the Rural Settlement. The Rural Settlement boundary exists precisely to mark where suburban development ends. If this rezoning is approved on the basis of adjacency, the boundary loses its meaning, and Tangerine will be eroded one parcel at a time.

HERE ARE MY REQUESTS:

1. The County recommends denial of the PD rezoning as proposed.
2. In the alternative, that any development of this property be limited to lots of at least one acre, consistent with the surrounding rural pattern, with no extension of central utilities to increase density.
3. The staff publishes the net developable acreage calculation, any utility service proposal, any Wekiva Study Area determination, and a traffic analysis before the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing.
4. I be added to the notification list for all future meetings, hearings, and staff reports on this case.

Tangerine residents chose this community because of its rural character, and the Comprehensive Plan has repeatedly promised to protect it. I urge the County to honor that commitment and reject this proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel Thomas
7831 Earlwood Ave.
Mount Dora, FL 32757
Phone: 407-538-1080