

Lake Ashton  
Community Development District  
&  
Lake Ashton II  
Community Development District  
Joint Meeting

July 19, 2024

# AGENDA

# *Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II*

## *Community Development Districts*

---

219 E. Livingston St., Orlando, Florida 32801

Phone: 407-841-5524 - Fax: 407-839-1526

July 12, 2024

**Board of Supervisors  
Lake Ashton & Lake Ashton II  
Community Development Districts**

Dear Board Members:

The joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the **Lake Ashton Community Development District and the Lake Ashton II Community Development District** will be held **Friday, July 19, 2024 at 11:00 AM at 6052 Pebble Beach Blvd., Winter Haven, FL 33884.**

Members of the public may attend and participate in the meeting utilizing the following options from your computer, tablet or smartphone. To participate using video, please go to the link address below. To participate by telephone, please use the call-in number below and enter the **Meeting ID** when prompted. Members of the public are further encouraged to submit comments or questions in advance of the workshop by email to [jgreenwood@gms-tampa.com](mailto:jgreenwood@gms-tampa.com), or by telephone by calling (813) 344-4844 up until **2:00 PM on Wednesday, July 17, 2024.**

**Zoom Video Link:**

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/4349046526?pwd=2KlYbE5HqhLmJjvua9Caswh4sCJeJ.1&omn=89604515500>

**Zoom Call-In Information:** 1-646-931-3860

**Meeting ID:** 434 904 6526

**Passcode:** YZ7mxp

Following is the advance agenda for the meeting:

### **Board of Supervisors Meeting**

1. Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance
2. Approval of Meeting Agenda
3. Public Comments on Specific Items on the Agenda (*the District Manager will read any questions or comments received from members of the public in advance of the meeting;*)

*we ask those members of the public wanting to address the Board directly, first state his or her name and his or her address.<sup>1</sup>)*

4. Approval of Minutes of the January 19, 2024 Joint Board of Supervisors Meeting
5. Discussion Regarding CDD Efficiency (*Requested by Supervisor VanSickle of the Lake Ashton CDD Board*)
6. Consideration of Fiscal Year 2025 Joint Meeting Schedule
  - A. Lake Ashton - Resolution 2024-10 Adopting the Joint Meeting Dates for FY 2025
  - B. Lake Ashton II - Resolution 2024-06 Adopting the Joint Meeting Dates for FY 2025
7. Discussion Regarding Pet Play Parks & LA Unleashed (*Requested by Supervisor VanSickle of the Lake Ashton CDD Board*)
8. Supervisors Requests and General Public Comments
9. Adjournment

---

<sup>1</sup> All comments, including those read by the District Manager, will be limited to three (3) minutes

# MINUTES

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
LAKE ASHTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND  
LAKE ASHTON II COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Lake Ashton Community Development District and Lake Ashton II Community Development District was held on Monday, **January 19, 2024** at 11:00 a.m. at 6052 Pebble Beach Blvd., Winter Haven, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Lloyd Howison  
Michael Costello  
Steve Realmuto  
Brenda VanSickle  
Deborah Landgrebe

Lake Ashton CDD Chairman  
Lake Ashton CDD Vice Chairman  
Lake Ashton CDD Assistant Secretary  
Lake Ashton CDD Assistant Secretary  
Lake Ashton CDD Assistant Secretary

James Mecsecs  
Bob Zelazny  
Mary Clark *via Zoom*  
Roy Aull  
Angie Littlewood

Lake Ashton II CDD Chairman  
Lake Ashton II CDD Vice Chairman  
Lake Ashton II CDD Assistant Secretary  
Lake Ashton II CDD Assistant Secretary  
Lake Ashton II CDD Assistant Secretary

Also present:

Jill Burns  
Jason Greenwood  
Jan Carpenter *via Zoom*  
Sarah Sandy *via Zoom*

District Manager, GMS  
District Manager, GMS  
Lake Ashton CDD District Counsel  
Lake Ashton II CDD District Counsel

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Greenwood called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. and called the roll. All Lake Ashton CDD Supervisors were present, and all Lake Ashton II Supervisors were present. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of Meeting Agenda**

Mr. Mecsics asked for any additions or corrections to the agenda as presented. There were no changes.

On MOTION by Ms. Littlewood, seconded by Mr. Zelazny, with all in favor, the Meeting Agenda for the Joint Board of Supervisors Meeting, was approved.

On MOTION by Mr. Costello, seconded by Ms. VanSickle, with all in favor, the Meeting Agenda for the Joint Board of Supervisors Meeting, was approved.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comments on Specific Items on the Agenda**

Mr. Mecsics asked for public comments related to specific items on the agenda. He noted that he received no comments before the meeting. There were no public comments at this time.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of Minutes of the October 16, 2023 Joint Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Mr. Mecsics asked for any changes or corrections to the minutes. Mr. Realmuto noted a correction on page two of the minutes. Both motion boxes should have “*were approved as amended*” when they approved the previous minutes.

On MOTION by Ms. VanSickle, seconded by Mr. Costello, with all in favor, the Minutes of the October 16, 2023 Joint Board of Supervisors Meeting, were approved as amended.

On MOTION by Mr. Zelazny, seconded by Ms. Littlewood, with all in favor, the Minutes of the October 16, 2023 Joint Board of Supervisors Meeting, were approved as amended.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Hearing to Adopt the Amended  
Joint Policy Related to Non-Resident  
User Fees & Disciplinary Policy**

Mr. Mecsics asked Lake Ashton I CDD to open the public hearing.

On MOTION by Ms. VanSickle, seconded by Ms. Landgrebe, with all in favor, Opening the Public Hearing, was approved.

Mr. Mecsics asked Lake Ashton II CDD to open the public hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Zelazny, seconded by Ms. Littlewood, with all in favor, Opening the Public Hearing, was approved.

Mr. Mecsics asked for any public comments. Resident Eileen Nashy (5213 Green Drive) asked about the pickleball issue being on the agenda. Mr. Mecsic responded that issue would be addressed at the Lake Ashton II meeting being held after this Joint Meeting. Hearing no further public comments, Mr. Greenwood asked Lake Ashton II to close the public hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Zelazny, seconded by Ms. Littlewood, with all in favor, Closing the Public Hearing, was approved.

Mr. Howison asked Lake Ashton I to close the public hearing.

On MOTION by Ms. VanSickle, seconded by Mr. Costello, with all in favor, Closing the Public Hearing, was approved.

**A. Resolution 2024-03 for Lake Ashton CDD**

Mr. Realmuto stated that before they move into the resolutions to approve the joint policies, their Board has not had a chance to discuss these. He knew the joint policies were the subject of extensive discussion in the Lake Ashton CDD II meeting and felt that Lake Ashton CDD I should have that opportunity to perhaps narrow the motions as amended.



Ms. Landgrebe stated that the committee, Bob, herself, Christine, and James have worked on the Joint Amenity Policies. This policy has been discussed multiple times. Before the Board, they had the most recent and revised policies. She asked if there were any questions or comments. She noted that they were going to take some editorial and grammatical changes that were suggested from legal.

On page four of the policies, Mr. Costello asked about, *“Residents, upon producing proper identification, can access and use all Amenity Facilities within the Districts. They are entitled to ~~bring~~ twelve (12) guest registrations per year, up to four (4) guests at a time, unless other arrangements have been made with an Amenity Manager.”* He asked if they were going to limit registrations. Ms. Landgrebe responded that it says, *“unless other arrangements have been made with an Amenity Manager.”* She explained that there has been a lot of abuse happening and this was an effort to help curtail that. Mr. Zelazny stated that the comment on limit twelve guest registrations has been in the document a long time. He explained that it was moved over so it would be consistent with other portions. Instead of it being just twelve guests, they did guest registrations up to four people to give them a few more people that they can have come in. He further explained that it was consistent with the document as it was in the past and they just put it there so it would be consistent.

On page four under *“RENTERS/LEASEHOLDERS”*, Ms. Landgrebe stated that the earlier discussion for Lake Ashton CDD II was regarding if they should keep it at 90 days, which is consistent with HOA policies, or move it to 30 days. The decision was to keep it at 90 days. She recommended that Lake Ashton I CDD do the same. Mr. Realmuto clarified that it is in the existing policy as 30 days and they are changing it to 90 days to be consistent with the Lake Ashton II HOA. He isn't sure if their HOA has the same number, but he commented that the whole community should be the same.

On page five of the policies, Ms. VanSickle commented on the policy, *“A Guest is limited to 12 Guest Registrations per year. Guest passes can be issued for a maximum of fifteen (15) consecutive days and may only be extended for a maximum of thirty (30) total consecutive days. A guest cannot be registered for more than ninety (90) total days in a 365-day period. A Guest's ability to be registered may be reviewed by an Amenity Manager if exceeding ~~12 Guest registrations annually~~ standards listed above.”*

recommending *“Guest passes may”* instead of *“Guest passes can.”* She explained that when they do this, they are not differentiating between a day guest or a house guest. She would like to see something about for a maximum of fifteen days correlating with length of stay because she doesn't want to have a day guest come in and get twelve days' worth of registrations. She suggested the wording to be written as *“correlation with length of stay”* or *“correlation with length of visit.”* She noted that she was up to different wording of that if legal could help them with that. Discussion ensued and Ms. Littlewood suggested saying, *“Guest passes can be issued for the length of stay with a maximum of fifteen (15) consecutive days.”* Both Boards agreed to Ms. Littlewood's suggestion.

On the top of page five of the policies, Mr. Realmuto commented that he liked the additions, but the statement, *“This fee will cover membership to all Amenity Facilities for one (1) fiscal year”*, no longer makes sense. He suggested replacing the word *“one”* with *“the current”* so it's clear that the membership is for the current fiscal year. The Boards agreed to Mr. Realmuto's suggestion. Ms. Burns asked that if they are doing it that way and they were to come part way through the fiscal year, would it be a prorated amount. The Boards clarified they were not prorating.

On page seven the policy states, *“Such restriction or suspension shall commence immediately for up to one (1) year”* and before that it was *“thirty (30) days.”* Ms. VanSickle asked what the justification was for that change. Mr. Zelazny responded that change to *“one (1) year”* was approved at two previous meetings and it was to give Christine and James latitude if it has something to do with health, welfare, and safety, which is an egregious action, versus the other suspensions and terminations that is found on page eight.

Ms. Landgrebe pointed out that on page eight they compressed the offenses to three instead of four. Ms. VanSickle noted that was another one of her concerns because it says, *“First Offense – Individuals will be asked to leave the amenities immediately”*. She suggested that it say, *“may be”* instead of *“will be”*. Ms. Landgrebe responded that judgement needed to be used and she would like to leave the policy as *“will be”*. Mr. Howison clarified that they were saying that they will be asked to leave the amenity and they may be issued a verbal or written warning. Ms. Sandy pointed out that at the header section, it says, *“its Boards, District Manager, and/or Amenity Manager, may follow the*

*process outlined below*”, which she noted was a little bit of discretion. Mr. Realmuto stated that it seemed to him that the Amenity Manager had discretion because it said, “*may be issued by the Amenity Manager*”. He added that the wording was not very clear, but if they could word it such that one followed the other, it would make more sense and would address Ms. VanSickle’s concern. Mr. Zelazny stated it probably would read better “*Individuals may be asked to leave*”. Ms. VanSickle stated that she likes the verbal warning. She explained that they are a friendly community, and they want to keep it that way. She added that they have rules in place to make sure it stays a friendly and safe community. Ms. Landgrebe responded that it would all be part of the first offense. Ms. VanSickle stated she would accept it with “*may*”.

Ms. Landgrebe reviewed the second and third offense changes. Ms. Littlewood noted concern of the first offense not saying whether they can come back or not and the second offense being an automatic suspension of thirty days. Ms. Landgrebe clarified that it was up to thirty days. Mr. Zelazny stated that all of the timeframes are open-ended giving the amenity manager the opportunity based on the offense. Ms. Landgrebe stated that their amenity managers and their security talk to the people and have procedures as well. Ms. Littlewood commented that it has to be consistent. Ms. Landgrebe noted that she would trust their amenity managers to make the right decision. Ms. Littlewood commented that she thinks it should be consistent across both amenity managers. Mr. Realmuto stated that it was important to give the amenity managers some flexibility and this does make the range sufficient. He added that he also liked the way the committee worked to reduce a rather complex one with a lot of different steps down into three, which is more understandable.

On page nine, the appeals section of the policies was discussed. Mr. Realmuto noted his issues with this section stating that the whole concept of having a different appeals process based on the length of the suspension was introduced the last time they saw the policy, but that was not approved because their attorneys determined that it required a public hearing first and it was not in the existing policy that they were being asked to approve today. He suggested that they only have one appeals process and it should not vary based on whether it’s under thirty days or over thirty days. He is not in favor of bringing things to the Joint Board that happen to be over ninety days. He added

that there was no need for the addition of the last sentence to resolve it. He pointed out that having both of those here also makes the paragraph inconsistent with others in the document that basically say each District is responsible for determining the suspensions or other remedies in their District. Ms. Landgrebe determined that the violations or suspension is handed to where the violation occurs. She explained that they were saying that if it was up to that year, then they would do a joint discussion. Mr. Zelazny noted that when they talk about the severity of a 90-day suspension from all amenities, the Board should have input on that to protect the rights of their citizens. He stated that if they were denying someone their access to a year on the activities that they are paying for and they have no representation from their elected body, he thought it was wrong. Mr. Realmuto agreed with Mr. Zelazny, but also suggested thirty days might merit the Board having input into it. He explained he didn't think it should have to wait 90 days to come to a joint meeting. Mr. Realmuto suggested that maybe they could set up another way of getting each Boards input. Mr. Zelazny noted that there would be a meeting and if it's early on, they could certainly have a special joint meeting to handle the appeal. He stated that their Board feels strongly that they are not going to support long-term termination of amenity access unless they have input. Ms. Littlewood commented that she thinks Mr. Realmuto wasn't saying they shouldn't be involved, but his point was there were too many different times, and he just wants one timeframe. Mr. Realmuto responded that was one problem and the other problem was having to wait up to 90 days to appeal it to the Joint Boards, which could also be an issue. Ms. Sandy indicated that if they are only holding quarterly joint meetings, it could be too long for the person to get due process, so they would need to schedule a special meeting. Mr. Howison asked if they could form a subcommittee or a committee consisting of members of both Boards that would be charged with dealing with appeals strictly. Mr. Costello responded that would be a violation of the Sunshine law. Ms. Sandy responded that they would still have to advertise, and it would still be an open meeting, but less people to coordinate among. It was noted that the appeals has to be public. Ms. Landgrebe suggested to just do a special meeting.

Ms. Landgrebe commented on a recommendation from Ms. Sandy at the top of page nine in the first line where it should say, "*the incident occurred.*" instead of "*the resident resides.*"

Ms. Littlewood stated that a question was raised to her about guest privileges. Ms. Littlewood's question was discussed by the Boards. Mr. Realmuto stated that his understanding was that they can't discriminate on the basis of who the guests are, but they are limited to twelve guest registrations per year. Ms. Sandy stated that they basically still have the same guest limitations as any other resident.

Mr. Howison asked for clarification on the statement, "Exceptions to the footwear requirements may be made with prior approval from the Amenity Manager.", which is on page sixteen of the amenity policies. Ms. Landgrebe explained that they have had times where the bowling shoes may not fit properly, or the person is not able to use them for mobility and their other shoes or type of sneaker could be used with preapproval from the amenity managers.

On page 29 in Exhibit A, the non-resident user fee was discussed. Ms. Sandy stated that it was her understanding that they were suggesting that the word, "household", be removed from "This fee shall include privileges for a household for up to two (2) people." Ms. Burns explained that it had to be two people residing in the same household taking advantage of the fee. Ms. Carpenter agreed she was ok with that.

Ms. Sandy stated that if they are moving forward with as the Exhibit A is written, then the Boards can vote separately.

After discussing the policies, Ms. Landgrebe commented that other than the non-member fee, their committee was proposing that they adopt this as amended. Mr. Howison clarified that they were leaving Exhibit A out of this vote. He asked Lake Ashton I CDD to adopt Resolution 2024-03 with grammatical changes minus Exhibit A.

On MOTION by Ms. Landgrebe, seconded by Mr. Costello, with all in favor, Resolution 2024-03 Joint Policy with the Grammatical Changes Minus Exhibit A, was approved as amended.
---

Mr. Mecsics asked Lake Ashton II CDD to adopt Resolution 2024-03 with grammatical changes minus Exhibit A.

On MOTION by Mr. Zelazny, seconded by Mr. Aull, with all in favor, Resolution 2024-03 Joint Policy with the Grammatical Changes Minus Exhibit A, was approved as amended.

Mr. Howison stated that in listening to the Lake Ashton CDD II meeting and their discussion earlier, his concern was they have got input from joint counsel regarding fees and that came out to \$3,876 plus \$250 administration fee, which came out to \$4,126. He thought the discussion of the CDD II Board came out to somewhere between \$5,000 and \$6,000. He noted a strong concern that if they go against recommendation of counsel, they open up their two Boards to potential litigation from potential non-resident members and/or some people suing CDDs. He recommended that they accept counsel's recommendation with the understanding that it's not ideal for them, but they also know that it is unlikely that they will be barraged with 200 requests. Mr. Greenwood added that there was two District counsels that spent several hours looking at this and researching it with their teams. He suggested to adopt something now. He added that on a positive side, if they did have 100 people sign up for this, that would be half a million dollars of reserves. Ms. Landgrebe responded that was not a positive side. Mr. Greenwood responded that it wasn't positive side, but a financial side. Ms. Sandy stated that it does change the calculation if they do have a large number of people taking advantage of this because it changes the calculations for both Districts. Ms. Landgrebe responded that it was not a benefit for either District. Mr. Aull stated if they want to talk about lawsuit, wait until they get a rush of people doing it and then raise the fee. Ms. Landgrebe recommended that they be proactive instead of saying to wait. She explained that there was no legal precedent that says coming to the \$5,000 or \$6,000 is not defensible. Ms. Sandy responded that she did provide their Board with a rather lengthy legal memo on how they can look at this and what their justifications and reasons that they can look at in coming to certain numbers and that was what they based the staff recommendation on. Ms. Landgrebe stated that Mr. Zelazny told them how they came to their numbers, which was very reasonable. Ms. Sandy reminded the Boards that they discussed talking about this at this meeting if justifications were going with the higher number and they would have to have something on the record. Ms. VanSickle stated that both attorneys and District managers have told them the same thing. She added that this was their field of

expertise. She stated that she wishes they could go with the higher number, but she thinks they have to go with something that is justifiable. She pointed out that she doesn't want to spend a lot of their money defending something. She recommended going with what they know is reasonable and have a reason for it. Mr. Realmuto stated that he wanted to share Mr. Howison's concerns and all of their concerns in terms of legal liability. His opinion was that if they were to adopt the fee without being able to explain it in detail on record, they stand to cause more damage and impact to the District than if by some miracle, one or two people decided they want non-resident access. Mr. Howison stated that he didn't believe that Exhibit A should have a number in it. He believes that Exhibit A should have the verbiage that says that the maximum debt and O&M so that every year that would automatically ratchet up. He asked legal counsel if there was any way they can limit the number of outside non-resident members that come in to this community. Ms. Landgrebe noted concern that their amenities were barely able to service all the residents there. She asked that if they can't service their own, how do they service more. Discussion ensued and Ms. Carpenter responded that if they find that there is a large number of users and they have reached the max pool capacity set by the state and they don't have the ability to make reservations for certain amenities, that would be where they could come back and have a reason to look at the fee. Then, they could look at restrictions and increase costs, but at this point, they don't have any evidence to support that or put a restriction on it. Ms. Landgrebe brought up Mr. Aull's comment asking if they raise the fees when they are in the midst of it, is that a lawsuit. Ms. Sandy responded that they don't have evidence to support that. Ms. Clark addressed the comment made that they don't have any evidence that the facilities are at capacity. She argued that they already do. She provided an example of LA II's concern about pickleball and not having enough pickleball courts. Ms. Sandy responded that they don't have evidence that they are going to have a large non-resident user contingent. Ms. Clark stated that they already have facilities that are maxed out. She noted that the point was what if they do get these extra people. She also noted again that they already do have facilities that are maxed out with residents not adding guests. She added that the bottom line was they have to decide on what the amenity fee is going to be. Ms. Littlewood asked for clarification that Ms. Clark was saying that they are already over capacity with the residents, which would be the

justification for setting a higher fee right now. Ms. Clark agreed. Ms. Sandy responded that was a reaction to the residents, which would be reflected in their O&M assessments versus the number of non-residents. Mr. Realmuto stated that they need to understand that in setting fees, they need to have a justification. That justification is these fees are what is necessary to support the facilities that the resident or non-resident has access to. He added that at the time that they both have an issue due to non-resident usage and they have to expand further funds for adding staff, pickleball courts, etc., that is a concrete example of how they have additional expenditures due to non-resident members. He commented in regard to increasing the non-resident fee further to accommodate that expansion is once they have the expenditures, not now. Ms. Sandy responded that when they are categorizing people, they have to have justification and justification to support the amount that they are setting to charge a different category of people. She agreed that at that time, they would have some justifications on how to change the number. She explained that they don't have evidence of this happening in the past. She further explained that an increase in demand would increase costs and would be a reason to increase it. Ms. Landgrebe asked for an answer in regard to what Mr. Howison asked about do they have to put the user fee number in there. Mr. Howison referred to the attachment to the email that was sent to them and noted that Ms. Landgrebe was recommending that verbiage. Ms. Burns responded that could roll up to the advertised amount without additional Board action. Mr. Aull noted that it was a no vote for him if it is under \$6,000. Justification was discussed and Ms. Sandy explained that the justification was that if there are additional non-resident members that join, they are going to have to hire additional staff, so a larger administrative fee for both Districts.

Ms. Burns noted that if they were going to do a motion to approve that language, they would also want to include the second paragraph that is in Exhibit A about the household of up to two residents.

<p>On MOTION by Ms. VanSickle, seconded by Mr. Realmuto, with Ms. VanSickle, Mr. Realmuto, Mr. Howison in favor and Ms. Landgrebe and Mr. Costello opposed, Exhibit A as Proposed by the Attorneys with the Additional Language in the Final Paragraph on Page 29, was approved 3-2.</p>
--



Ms. Burns explained how they arrived at \$125. She stated that she asked Christine about how much time it takes for staff to register a resident for amenity use. They were told that process would take maybe an hour, maybe an hour and a half at the most. She also included some time on the back end to then deactivate their cards. She further explained that figuring if they were going to charge by the hour for staff time, that may be \$50-\$75 an hour for a couple of the hours of work, which is justifiable. Mr. Mecsics made the argument that was sort of arbitrary and they don't have anything quantifiable other than a community manager. Mr. Mecsics made a motion that they have their fee of \$4,500. Ms. Burns stated that the total would be \$4,376 if the Boards go with a \$500 administration fee. Mr. Zelazny stated that in Ms. Sandy's discussion it is that they agree with the writing, which is the highest O&M, the highest bond, and plus \$500 administration. He noted that it would be nice to have an amended motion that talks to that because then it gets in there and they don't have to have any numbers. Mr. Mecsics amended his motion to Mr. Zelazny's statement. Mr. Zelazny stated that he still believes that is too low. Ms. Sandy clarified that the language would be the annual user fee is equal to the highest annual operation and maintenance assessment and debt assessment as established by the Districts in connection with the adoption of the Districts annual fiscal year budgets plus a \$500 administrative fee split \$250 per District, which amount shall annually decrease each year based upon the Districts adoptive budget. The fee is to be paid annually. Then, the addition of the last paragraph stating that the fee shall include privileges for a household of up to two (2) people. All prior rules / policies of the District governing this subject matter are hereby rescinded. This membership is not available for commercial purposes and is not transferable.

On MOTION by Mr. Mecsics, seconded by Ms. Littlewood, with Mr. Mecsics, Ms. Littlewood, Mr. Zelazny, Ms. Clark in favor and Mr. Aull opposed, Exhibit A as Proposed by the Attorneys except increasing the Administrative Fee to \$500 total with the Additional Language in the Final Paragraph on Page 29, was approved 4-1.

Mr. Howison stated that LA CDD II has approved a different approach than LA CDD I has. He explained that theirs would increase the administrative fee from \$250 to

\$500 total. That would bring the total for a non-resident to \$4,375.55 this year. He noted that LA CDD II has approved a non-resident assessment that would be the total of debt and O&M assessment plus a \$500 administrative fee. In the interest of consistency, Mr. Howison made a motion that they adopt that same fee, which is the highest debt and O&M plus \$500 administrative fee. Mr. Realmuto asked their legal staff and District Manager if they were comfortable with that amount and if they will defend it. Ms. Carpenter and Ms. Burns responded. Ms. Burns stated that if James and Christine were comfortable saying they think that's the amount of time that they would spend registering a new resident for their amenity access, then she thinks that is supportable because they are saying that's reasonable. She added that nobody does this, and they don't have a basis to know how long it takes to register a non-resident there because from the year 2005 to today, nobody has ever asked. Ms. Sandy stated that just hearing from the Board, there is a concern about the amount of development going around. So, if there did have to be additional staff hired to do things throughout, that's the additional justification.

On MOTION by Mr. Howison, seconded by Ms. VanSickle, with Mr. Howison, Ms. VanSickle, Mr. Realmuto in favor and Mr. Costello and Ms. Landgrebe opposed, Exhibit A as Proposed by the Attorneys except increasing the Administrative Fee to \$500 total with the Additional Language in the Final Paragraph on Page 29, was approved 3-2.

Ms. Burns explained that what Ms. Sandy passed out, the Exhibit A, says that they are going to split the admin fee. She didn't know if it was implied that the actual fee is being split, but it is in the first paragraph, not the second. She thinks that they just want to clarify the language that the admin fee and the non-resident user fee is split between both Districts. She didn't think they needed to revote.

Ms. Burns requested approval of the resolutions.

On MOTION by Mr. Zelazny, seconded by Ms. Littlewood, with Mr. Zelazny, Ms. Littlewood, Ms. Clark, and Mr. Mecsics in favor and Mr. Aull opposed, Resolution 2024-01, was approved 4-1 as amended.

On MOTION by Ms. VanSickle, seconded by Mr. Realmuto, with all in favor, Resolution 2024-03, was approved as amended.

**B. Resolution 2024-01 for Lake Ashton II CDD**

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Update from Both CDDs Regarding Security Access Projects**

Mr. Mecsics updated the Boards on the security access projects.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Discussion of a Joint Policy for Issuance of RFID Tags – Supervisor Costello & Supervisor Mecsics**

Mr. Mecsics recommended that they empower both Christine and James as well as Mr. Costello and himself to merge the documents and have that as their joint policy for the RFID tags.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisor Requests and General Public Comments**

Mr. Mecsics asked for Supervisor requests and public comments.

Iris Realmuto (Lot 1031) commented that capacity was raised. She asked if it was possible at some point to add a limit on the number of non-member residents because of capacity. Mr. Mecsics responded that he thinks that is a no.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

There not being any further business to discuss,

On MOTION by Ms. VanSickle, seconded by Ms. Landgrebe, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned by the Lake Ashton CDD Board.

On MOTION by Mr. Aull, seconded by Ms. Littlewood, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned by the Lake Ashton II CDD Board.

January 19, 2024

Lake Ashton CDD & Lake Ashton II CDD

---

Secretary / Assistant Secretary

---

Chairman / Vice Chairman

# SECTION VI

# SECTION A

**RESOLUTION 2024-10**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE LAKE ASHTON II COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND THE LAKE ASHTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ADOPTING THE ANNUAL JOINT MEETING SCHEDULE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024-25; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE**

**WHEREAS**, the Lake Ashton II Community Development District (“Lake Ashton CDD II”) and Lake Ashton Community District (“Lake Ashton CDD”) are a local unit of special-purpose government created and existing pursuant to Chapter 190, *Florida Statutes*, and situated entirely within Polk County, Florida; and

**WHEREAS**, the District’s are required by Section 189.015, *Florida Statutes*, to file quarterly, semi-annually, or annually a schedule (including date, time, and location) of its regular meetings with local governing authorities; and

**WHEREAS**, further, in accordance with the above-referenced statute, the District’s shall also publish quarterly, semi-annually, or annually the District’s regular meeting schedule in a newspaper of general paid circulation in the county in which the District’s are located; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board desires to adopt the Fiscal Year 2024-25 annual joint meeting schedule attached as **Exhibit A**.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE LAKE ASHTON II COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND LAKE ASHTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT:**

**SECTION 1.** The Fiscal Year 2024-25 annual meeting schedule attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein as **Exhibit A** is hereby approved and shall be published in accordance with the requirements of Florida law and also provided to applicable governing authorities.

**SECTION 2.** This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2024.

ATTEST:

**LAKE ASHTON COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson, Board of Supervisors

**Exhibit A:** Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Annual Meeting Schedule

**Exhibit A**

**NOTICE OF JOINT MEETINGS OF THE LAKE ASHTON AND LAKE ASHTON II  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS  
FISCAL YEAR 2024-2025**

The Board of Supervisors of the Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II Community Development Districts will hold joint scheduled public meetings for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 as follows, unless otherwise indicated:

**Monday, October 21, 2024 at 11:30 AM at the Lake Ashton Clubhouse Ballroom, 4141 Ashton Club Drive, Lake Wales, Florida (after Lake Ashton CDD regular meeting)**

**Friday, January 17, 2025 at 11:00 AM at the Health & Fitness Center, 6052 Pebble Beach Blvd., Winter Haven, FL 33884 (after Lake Ashton II CDD regular meeting)**

**Monday, April 21, 2025 at 11:30 AM at the Lake Ashton Clubhouse Ballroom, 4141 Ashton Club Drive, Lake Wales, Florida (after Lake Ashton CDD regular meeting)**

**Friday, July 18, 2025 at 11:00 AM at the Health & Fitness Center, 6052 Pebble Beach Blvd., Winter Haven, FL 33884 (after Lake Ashton II CDD regular meeting)**

The meetings are open to the public and will be conducted in accordance with the provision of Florida Law for Community Development Districts. The meetings may be continued to a date, time, and place to be specified on the record at the meeting. A copy of the agenda for these meetings may be obtained from Governmental Management Services – 219 E. Livingston Street, Orlando, FL 32801 or by calling (407) 841-5524.

There may be occasions when one or more Supervisors or staff will participate by telephone. Pursuant to provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations at this meeting because of a disability or physical impairment should contact the District Office at (407) 841-5524 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact the Florida Relay Service by dialing 7-1-1, or 1-800-955-8771 (TTY) / 1-800-955-8770 (Voice), for aid in contacting the District Office.

A person who decides to appeal any decision made at the meeting with respect to any matter considered at the meeting is advised that person will need a record of the proceedings and that accordingly, the person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, including the testimony and evidence upon which such appeal is to be based.

Jill Burns  
District Manager



# SECTION B

**RESOLUTION 2024-06**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE LAKE ASHTON II COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND THE LAKE ASHTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ADOPTING THE ANNUAL JOINT MEETING SCHEDULE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024-25; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE**

**WHEREAS**, the Lake Ashton II Community Development District (“Lake Ashton CDD II”) and Lake Ashton Community District (“Lake Ashton CDD”) are a local unit of special-purpose government created and existing pursuant to Chapter 190, *Florida Statutes*, and situated entirely within Polk County, Florida; and

**WHEREAS**, the District’s are required by Section 189.015, *Florida Statutes*, to file quarterly, semi-annually, or annually a schedule (including date, time, and location) of its regular meetings with local governing authorities; and

**WHEREAS**, further, in accordance with the above-referenced statute, the District’s shall also publish quarterly, semi-annually, or annually the District’s regular meeting schedule in a newspaper of general paid circulation in the county in which the District’s are located; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board desires to adopt the Fiscal Year 2024-25 annual joint meeting schedule attached as **Exhibit A**.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE LAKE ASHTON II COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND LAKE ASHTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT:**

**SECTION 1.** The Fiscal Year 2024-25 annual meeting schedule attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein as **Exhibit A** is hereby approved and shall be published in accordance with the requirements of Florida law and also provided to applicable governing authorities.

**SECTION 2.** This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2024.

ATTEST:

**LAKE ASHTON II COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

---

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

---

Chairperson, Board of Supervisors

**Exhibit A:** Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Annual Meeting Schedule

**Exhibit A**

**NOTICE OF JOINT MEETINGS OF THE LAKE ASHTON AND LAKE ASHTON II  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS  
FISCAL YEAR 2024-2025**

The Board of Supervisors of the Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II Community Development Districts will hold joint scheduled public meetings for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 as follows, unless otherwise indicated:

**Monday, October 21, 2024 at 11:30 AM at the Lake Ashton Clubhouse Ballroom, 4141 Ashton Club Drive, Lake Wales, Florida (after Lake Ashton CDD regular meeting)**

**Thursday, January 16, 2025 at 11:00 AM at the Health & Fitness Center, 6052 Pebble Beach Blvd., Winter Haven, FL 33884 (after Lake Ashton II CDD regular meeting)**

**Monday, April 21, 2025 at 11:30 AM at the Lake Ashton Clubhouse Ballroom, 4141 Ashton Club Drive, Lake Wales, Florida (after Lake Ashton CDD regular meeting)**

**Thursday, July 17, 2025 at 11:00 AM at the Health & Fitness Center, 6052 Pebble Beach Blvd., Winter Haven, FL 33884 (after Lake Ashton II CDD regular meeting)**

The meetings are open to the public and will be conducted in accordance with the provision of Florida Law for Community Development Districts. The meetings may be continued to a date, time, and place to be specified on the record at the meeting. A copy of the agenda for these meetings may be obtained from Governmental Management Services – Tampa, LLC, 4530 Eagle Falls Place, Tampa, FL 33619 or by calling (813) 344-4844.

There may be occasions when one or more Supervisors or staff will participate by telephone. Pursuant to provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations at this meeting because of a disability or physical impairment should contact the District Office at (813) 344-4844 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact the Florida Relay Service by dialing 7-1-1, or 1-800-955-8771 (TTY) / 1-800-955-8770 (Voice), for aid in contacting the District Office.

A person who decides to appeal any decision made at the meeting with respect to any matter considered at the meeting is advised that person will need a record of the proceedings and that accordingly, the person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, including the testimony and evidence upon which such appeal is to be based.

Jason Greenwood  
District Manager