

**MINUTES REPORT  
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY  
March 26, 2012**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Noel Andress (Vice Chair)	Ron Inge (Chair)
Wayne Daltry	Ann Pierce
Jim Green	Roger Strelow
Mitch Hutchcraft (Arrived at 10:45 a.m.)	

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Peter Blackwell, Planning	Kathie Ebaugh, Planning
Rick Burris, Planning	Janet Miller, Recording Secretary
Donna Marie Collins, Asst. Cty. Atty.	Matt Noble, Planning
Brandon Dunn, Planning	Paul O'Connor, Planning Director

**Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order, Certificate of Affidavit of Publication**

Mr. Inge, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Chambers of the Old Lee County Courthouse, 2120 Main Street in downtown Fort Myers.

Ms. Collins, Assistant County Attorney, certified the affidavit of publication and stated it was legally sufficient as to form and content.

**Agenda Item 2 - Pledge of Allegiance**

**Agenda Item 3 - Public Forum** - None

**Agenda Item 4 – Approval of Minutes – February 27, 2012**

Ms. Pierce referred to the third paragraph on Page 7 and stated the last sentence should read, “*She referred to Punta Gorda and noted that they have marketed themselves heavily, **particularly to the retirement community**, and have done other things to make their area successful. **They have a goal to establish themselves as the number one bicycling city in the United States and the most walkable city in the United States. So far, they have achieved Florida’s Bicycle Friendly Community of the Year.**”*

**Mr. Andress made a motion to approve the February 27, 2012 meeting minutes as corrected, seconded by Ms. Pierce. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. Daltry asked about prior discussion between the LPA and staff on getting information on vacant structures and buildings.

Mr. Inge asked for clarity on what type of information is desired.

Mr. Andress stated there was a need for housing inventory information. It is important to see what our housing needs are in terms of future development. In order to do that, we need to see what the inventory is in terms of affordable housing that is vacant and on the market in the community.

Mr. O'Connor stated staff no longer receives this information because their previous source began charging for the service. Therefore, the County only has two year old data along with a map that shows where the foreclosures were taking place, but the information is outdated.

Mr. Daltry asked if Human Services had any updated information.

Mr. O'Connor stated that Human Services had some numbers, but they were county-wide, not spatially grounded. Therefore, the information did not seem to help.

Ms. Ebaugh stated staff had contacted several departments within the County, but everyone had information at least two years old. The data they had only showed the number of foreclosures at that time, but there was no indication of where the foreclosures were or what type of structure it was.

Mr. Inge asked if the Affordable Housing Committee had this data.

Mr. Andress stated he had checked with them, but their information was also two years old. He suggested getting the information from other sources such as the utility, power, or phone companies.

Mr. Green stated the term "vacant" was not used by Realty Trac. For instance, there are foreclosures and there are different steps in the foreclosure process where you can obtain some data. However, the fact that a home is foreclosed does not mean it is vacant.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the term "vacant" is not a very qualifying word in certain areas in the County where houses are considered not occupied. In an area such as Lehigh, there is a low vacancy rate, whereas in Boca Grande, there is a high list of unoccupied homes because people only live there several months out of the year. Staff has tracked this data for years through the census and has a good idea of what the seasonal rate is by planning community. However, this is difficult to do when it comes to the foreclosure crisis. You cannot take the data and project it out on a 20 year planning horizon because, hopefully, those numbers are going to start turning around and changing.

Mr. Andress mentioned data released by the Board of Realtors in Charlotte County that showed the available housing inventory in Charlotte County at 6.9 months, which is historically the lowest amount of housing inventory that is available in the history of the MLS in Charlotte County. This information means that currently the supply of available housing is dwindling to the point where we are going to see some resurgence in the construction industry. This type of data helps in the planning process.

Mr. Inge suggested that members who have access to information from realtor association groups share it with the LPA and staff because that might be valid data to review.

Mr. O'Connor stated he did have some census data for the Board, which he was planning to discuss under "Other Business."

## **Agenda Item 5 – New Horizon 2035: Plan Amendments**

### **A. CPA2011-00014 – Vision Statement**

Mr. Dunn reviewed the staff report and recommendations.

Mr. Daltry referred to the third paragraph on Page 3 of the staff report and felt further clarification on the term “*technological change*” was needed.

Mr. Daltry referred to the first bullet point on Page 4 of the staff report where it states, “...*new business opportunities afforded by the Southwest Florida International Airport, Florida Gulf Coast University, the Daniels Road and Alico Road Interstate Interchange Areas, and the Research and Enterprise Diamond.*” To him, it seemed we were shifting an infrastructure strategy to this location from other places in the County. This area is not very populated, does not have a dominance of existing jobs, or the vacant land that would be used to create jobs. He asked why Edison State College was not mentioned. He was not sure what this change would mean to North Fort Myers where they have a community plan in place with significant redevelopment and development in existing areas with at least rudimentary infrastructure. He asked what the intent of this was as well as what the revenue sources would be to this new location.

Ms. Pierce agreed with Mr. Daltry’s comments and felt this new language seemed counter to the other major impetus of this revision which is to focus on redevelopment and infill in a mixed use Transit Oriented Development in North Fort Myers, Lehigh, as well as College and Winkler areas. It seemed to be moving the resources further south, which would have to be at the expense of other areas.

Mr. Address stated he had met with the University and they are expecting in the near future an enrollment of 18,000-20,000 students at full build-out. The airport itself has almost a billion dollars worth of projects that are in some stage of planning or development. In addition, there have been some future land use map changes that will bring more growth to that area. Therefore, these areas will be the ones where significant growth will take place due to infrastructure that is committed there already.

Mr. Inge understood all points mentioned on this and suggested a language change such as: “...*new business opportunities afforded by areas such as the Southwest Florida International Airport, Florida Gulf Coast University, the Daniels Road and Alico Road Interstate Interchange Areas, and the Research and Enterprise Diamond, among others.”*

Mr. Green agreed to this suggested revised language but asked we add the words “*where we want to encourage infill*” after the word “*areas*” so that it would read, “...*new business opportunities afforded by areas such as the Southwest Florida International Airport, Florida Gulf Coast University, the Daniels Road and Alico Road Interstate Interchange Areas, and the Research and Enterprise Diamond, among others where we want to encourage infill.*”

Mr. Daltry stated his concern was regarding the places that are tagged for intensive redevelopment to meet the needs of existing populations in places that have the vacancies that are expected to be inhabited. We do not currently know if the infrastructure is there and if it is capable of providing the development we thought. His hesitation with prioritization is that an assessment has not been done on what is needed in the places that are tagged for redevelopment.

Ms. Pierce referred to the third bullet point on Page 4 of the staff report and asked that some words be added between the words “*including*” and “*transportation.*” The suggested words are “*complete*” and “*safe*” or “*functional*” and “*safe*” or “*viable*” and “*safe.*” Wherever the word “*transportation*” appears in this document, it should be coupled with the word “*safe.*” She noted that Florida is 50 out of 50 worst in pedestrian and bicycle safety and this reputation is well known across the country.

Mr. Inge referred to the second line of the first paragraph on Page 3 of the staff report and asked for the definition for the term “*sustainable*.”

Mr. Dunn stated this paragraph was adopted by the Board and came directly from the Evaluation and Appraisal Report. There is not a definition in place that is agreed to by everyone yet.

Mr. Inge stated this term is used often by various people and he was concerned with a disconnect on the definition at this point in time.

Ms. Pierce mentioned the Citizens Sustainability Advisory Committee who adopted a definition for the term “*sustainability*.” They also have completed a thorough sustainability assessment, which was presented to the Board of County Commissioners. It was adopted and there is an ongoing process. She suggested using them as a possible resource in coming up with our own definition.

Mr. Inge opened this item for public comment. No public input was received.

Mr. Daltry referred to the third paragraph on Page 3 of the staff report and stated the County could not attain a projected increase in population to 1,016,900 with the infrastructure and tools on hand. He suggested a language change to this paragraph which would take care of his concerns. **Mr. Daltry made a motion to strike the word “*probable*” and insert the word “*needed*”, seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

**Mr. Green referred to the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point on Page 4 of the staff report and made a motion to make the following language change: “...*new business opportunities afforded by areas such as the Southwest Florida International Airport, Florida Gulf Coast University, the Daniels Road and Alico Road Interstate Interchange Areas, and the Research and Enterprise Diamond, among others where we want to encourage infill.*”** The motion was seconded by Mr. Daltry. **It was called and passed 6-0.**

Ms. Pierce referred to the third bullet point on Page 4 of the staff report. **She made a motion to add the words “*viable*” and “*safe*” in between the words “*including*” and “*transportation*” so that it would read, “...including *viable and safe* transportation options.”** The motion was seconded by Mr. Daltry. **It was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. Inge referred the second paragraph on Page 3 and the first bullet point on Page 4 of the staff report and asked for suggestions regarding the terms “*sustainability*” or “*sustainable*.”

After further discussion, it was determined that the Comprehensive Plan has a glossary where the term “*Sustainability*” will be added, which will be brought before the LPA at some point.

**Mr. Andress made a motion that a proposed definition for “*Sustainability*” be brought to the LPA for consideration in light of the addition that will be made to the Glossary and in terms of how it is to be added into the plan in various places, seconded by Mr. Strelow. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Regarding an overall motion, Mr. Daltry stated the LPA should only accept the elements but hold them in abeyance until the LPA has a chance to see the entire packet of elements one more time before they get forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners because other conflicts might be identified in other elements.

**Mr. Andress made a motion to accept the element as amended and hold it in abeyance until the LPA has reviewed all the elements and submit them as a packet, seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. O'Connor stated that the Glossary would be one of the last elements the LPA would see because there would probably be other terms that will be brought up. He noted staff would supply the LPA with the definition for "*sustainability*" from the Sustainability Assessment document for **discussion only** at next month's meeting. Staff will not be seeking a motion on it at that meeting.

**B. CPA2011-00017 – Community Safety and Wellbeing Element**

Mr. Blackwell reviewed the staff report and recommendations.

Lengthy discussion, questions, and answers took place between the LPA and staff regarding various sections of this amendment. The LPA's concerns and recommendations are outlined in their motions below.

Mr. Inge opened this item for public input. Public input was received from Steven Brodtkin.

Mr. Brodtkin noted that "*complete streets*" may have a different definition in rural areas versus urban areas. In the urban area where he resides, they have county roads with 9 foot lanes with no shoulder area because the maximum legal width for vehicles is 8 ½ feet. He felt it was a dangerous situation because there are many bicyclists and some pedestrians in the area. Although sidewalks are not appropriate in rural areas, there are a few areas that have paved shoulders that accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians more safely. He was not sure any of this was addressed in this particular document. The public would like to see more paved shoulders to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians on at least any county maintained roads. Regarding discussions on wildfires, he hoped this element promotes more controlled burns which will reduce some of the wildfire danger. When people do not burn over natural areas for many years, you wind up using more fuel for the fires which makes them worse and more intense. Regarding emergency natural disasters or man-made disasters, he suggested the element address something regarding the amount of reserves that would be needed to cover these emergencies in the County.

Ms. Pierce referred to Page 3 of the staff report and stated she wanted to rearrange the order in which the goals are presented. **Ms. Pierce made a motion to move the last 2 ½ lines of the intent paragraph to the first part and to move Goal 4 to the beginning so that it would become Goal 1. The remaining goals would move sequentially down. As part of the motion, the word "addresses" will be replaced with "enhance." In addition, the words "viable" and "safe" would be added before the word "transportation." The motion was seconded by Mr. Andress. The motion was called and failed 4-2. Ms. Pierce and Mr. Andress were in favor. Mr. Inge, Mr. Daltry, Mr. Strelow, and Mr. Green were opposed.**

Mr. Daltry referred to the name at the top of the page that reads, "*10. Public Health and Safety Element.*" He noted it should match the name of the staff report which is "*Community Safety and Wellbeing Element.*"

Staff stated this was a typo that would be corrected and that no motion was required.

**Mr. Green referred to Objective 1.1 on Page 3 of the staff report and noted the word “technological” would be changed to “man made.” This change should also be made anywhere else in the document where the word “technological” relates to a hazard. The motion was seconded by Mr. Strelow. It was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. Andress referred to Policy 1.1.6 on Page 4 of the staff report **and made a motion that staff will come back with discussion on the definition of “Joint Unified Local Mitigation Strategy.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Strelow. It was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. Daltry referred to Page 4 of the staff report and made a motion to add a new Policy 1.1.8 which will read, *“The County will consider the level of financial reserves appropriate for disaster recovery.”* **The motion was seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. Andress referred to an earlier discussion where Mr. Strelow referred to Objective 1.3 on Page 5 of the staff report and requested the word “natural” be deleted so that it just says “disasters,” which will include all types of disasters such as *man-made*.

**Mr. Andress made a motion to delete the word “natural” so that it just says “disaster,” seconded by Mr. Strelow. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. Daltry referred to Page 5 of the staff report where it mentions V and A zones. He stated V and A zones are still terms of definition in the flood insurance program. He felt staff should look into this and apprise the LPA at a future meeting before deleting one of the terms.

**Mr. Andress made a motion to ask staff to review the change in that definition and bring back information for further discussion at next month’s meeting, seconded by Mr. Daltry. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

**Mr. Daltry referred to Objective 1.6, Policy 1.6.1, and Policy 1.6.2 on Page 8 of the staff report and made a motion that the year 2030 be changed to 2035 to be consistent with the Planning Horizon, seconded by Mr. Andress. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. O’Connor referred to earlier discussion that took place regarding Policy 1.6.1 on Page 8 of the staff report regarding the ten (10) percent of the population and stated his answer is that this is why we picked it as a percentage. Staff realizes that population is going to change, which will cause this number to change. Staff did not want to pick a set number because we have no way of knowing what the number will be 10 years from now. They felt it best to go with a percentage of that population.

Mr. Daltry stated his point was that targeting a percentage at a date in the future was not the same thing as targeting adding spaces annually to meet that number some date in the future. The County habitually sets targets for some time in the future. When that date gets here with the goal unfulfilled, the County keeps shifting the date. Since we are discussing sheltering against loss of life, keeping the pressure on with an annual goal and adding shelter space equal to 10 percent of annual growth may be more compelling than a number and a date somewhat far off.

**Mr. Andress referred to Objective 1.7 on Page 9 and made a motion that the word “natural” in the second line be deleted, seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. Andress referred to Policy 1.7.2 on Page 9 of the staff report and noted it mentions V and A zones. The previous motion applies to this policy as well. No motion is necessary at this point until staff brings this item back for further discussion.

Mr. Hutchcraft arrived at this point in the discussion; therefore, seven members were in attendance. The motions from this point on are with seven votes until Mr. Strelow leaves.

**Mr. Strelow referred to Policy 2.3.2 on Page 14 of the staff report and made a motion to recommend: 1) changing the word "efforts" to "actions"; 2) insert the words "and welfare" after the word "health" because air and water quality regulation is not just limited to public health; and, 3) instead of "clean air and water requirements" it would say "through maintaining and enhancing air and water quality." The motion was seconded by Mr. Daltry.**

The policy should read, *"Actions to protect public health and welfare through maintaining and enhancing air and water quality."*

Mr. Hutchcraft felt further clarification was needed because the way it is currently written it could be interpreted as meaning that we would maintain and expand our actions instead of applying to air and water quality.

After further discussion, it was changed to:

*"Actions will be expanded and improved to protect public health and welfare through maintaining and enhancing air and water quality."*

**The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

**Mr. Daltry referred to Page 14 of the staff report and made a motion to create a Policy 2.2.5 to "promote coordination with natural resource entities to reestablish ground water and surface water levels consistent with public health to reduce wild fire risk." He noted that the baseline is the wildfire risk shown on the maps, seconded by Mr. Strelow.**

Mr. O'Connor stated this could be a very expensive policy.

Mr. Andress stated efforts had taken place for years to get the Water Management District to establish surficial aquifer levels which would be necessary to implement a policy like this, but to-date, this has not taken place. He noted the idea was to not allow the watering to get to the extent where you are drawing down the areas of wetlands that are providing habitat for fish and wildlife. Without surficial aquifer levels, it is difficult to set any kind of area wide standard. He felt this new policy would be beyond the economic viability of the county to do something like that.

Mr. Hutchcraft did not feel we had data and analysis to establish a baseline that we could *"reestablish"* to. To the extent that the comprehensive plan has to be measurable, he did not know how we would ever achieve that standard. He also was not sure Lee County would be the most effective agency to implement this rule as there is a lot of water level management that does not come under the purview of the county. Mr. Hutchcraft stated there would be a cost issue with this policy and it was beyond the scope of what the County should be addressing at this point.

Mr. Strelow understood the concerns, but stated we were only talking about goals and policies not a mandatory number that someone has to achieve. He noted Mr. Daltry was only talking about Lee County coordinating with water resource entities not mandating a specific result. This new policy only says this issue is a matter of concern and relevant Lee County agencies should coordinate with resource water management entities.

Mr. Green felt this was a good idea.

Ms. Pierce also was in favor of the motion, but noted there seemed to be contention with the word "re-establish" and the fact that we did not have a baseline. She suggested using the word "establish."

The motioner and seconder agreed to change the verbiage as follows:

*"Promote coordination with water resource entities to establish groundwater and surface water levels consistent with public health to reduce wildfire risk." The motion was called and passed 7-0.*

**Mr. Daltry referred to Policy 2.4.6 on Page 15 of the staff report and made a motion to change the verbiage to: "Lee County will consider appropriate federal and state targets, as applicable, and will set desired levels of greenhouse gas emissions and set emission reduction targets based on data such as from the Lee County Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory completed in 2010. The motion was seconded by Mr. Strelow. It was called and passed 5-2. Mr. Strelow, Mr. Daltry, Mr. Address, Ms. Pierce, and Mr. Green were in favor. Mr. Inge and Mr. Hutchcraft were opposed.**

Mr. Inge noted his opposition was that he did not feel Lee County should be in the business of setting the desired level of greenhouse emissions because they do not have the technical expertise required. He was also concerned with establishing a regulatory standard on that particular issue as part of the comprehensive plan. The language also uses the word "consider," which does not restrict the County to pick what the federal and state targets.

Mr. Hutchcraft stated he had the same concern that the above language would leave it open for the County to "consider" but set an arbitrary standard that is not based in data and analysis that could have significant economic ramifications on the county.

Mr. Address stated he could not imagine the county setting a standard other than the federal standard.

Ms. Pierce stated it would be based on our own greenhouse gas inventories which are kept current.

**Mr. Strelow referred to the second line of the first sentence under Objective 2.4 on Page 15 of the staff report and made a motion to change the word "standards" to "requirements," seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

**Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 2.4.5 on Page 15 of the staff report and made a motion that the second line say, "...transit use, car pooling/van pooling or telecommuting..." into that series, seconded by Mr. Address. She clarified that "telecommuting refers to the last four words "to reduce transportation emissions."**

Mr. Hutchcraft stated that if we wanted the opportunity to address a variety of uses we should use a broader phrase rather than giving a specific list.



Ms. Pierce was favorable to saying “*all modes of alternative transportation,*” but also wanted to address “*telecommuting,*” which is not normally thought of as a mode of transportation even though it is a means of reducing transportation. The language was changed to read, “*Enhance the multi-mode transportation system identified in the Transportation Element to increase opportunities for all modes of alternative transportation, including telecommuting, to reduce transportation emissions.*” **The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

Mr. Inge referred to Page 16 of the staff report and stated his only concern was over the interpretation of “*all new development*” to the detriment of any existing quarry operators that may not be in the excluded categories. However, he acknowledged that Mr. Blackwell stated this is current policy that has not prohibited those from being developed. With that clarification, he did not feel a motion was necessary.

**Mr. Daltry referred to Objective 4.1 on Page 18 of the staff report and made a motion to remove the word “Urban” in the title so that it just says, “Design,” seconded by Mr. Green.**

Mr. Address suggested “Urban Design” be replaced with “Community Design” since we are designing communities.

**The motioner and seconder agreed to the change. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

**Mr. Daltry referred to Policy 4.1.1 on Page 18 and made a motion to change the verbiage to: “The County will promote the use of the Complete Street set of designs for new development and redevelopment, including that of infrastructure.”**

Mr. Hutchcraft stated the complete street set of designs are appropriate for certain streets, but there are other times where it would be an inefficient use of our capital. He felt some flexibility should be built in.

Discussion took place on possibly adding the words “where appropriate” at the end to allow some flexibility.

The verbiage was changed to: “*The County will promote the use of the appropriate Complete Street set of designs for new development and redevelopment, including that of infrastructure.” **The motioner and seconder agreed to the amendment. The motion was called and passed 7-0.***

Mr. Inge referred to Policy 4.1.2 on Page 18 of the staff report and noted he and Mr. Address had concerns with the liability aspects of incorporating greenways which are public transit corridors into private property designs. How do we address the liability aspect and what do we do in terms of credits or compensation to the private land owner on which we are placing public facilities?

**Mr. Address made a motion to change the verbiage to: “New development and redevelopment in locations with the Greenways Trail system will incorporate the greenways into their site design and provide pedestrian access to the system where liability issues and incentives for the use of private property can be addressed.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft. It was called and passed 7-0.**

**Mr. Address made a motion to apply this same verbiage to Policy 4.2.2 as well, seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

**Ms. Pierce referred to the second line in Policy 4.1.4 on Page 19 of the staff report and made a motion to remove the word "greater" and replace it with "functional and connected pedestrian access," seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 7-0.**

Lengthy discussion took place on Policy 4.1.5 on Page 19 of the staff report. Some members felt staff should define what they consider to be a healthy lifestyle because it is too broad as well as how we would encourage development to promote it. What standards would be applied? Other members felt it was only an encouragement not a standard.

**Mr. Hutchcraft made a motion to delete Policy 4.1.5, seconded by Mr. Address.**

Mr. Green was not in favor of deleting this policy because he did not see it as dictatorial. He stated the County should want to encourage healthier lifestyles and felt it should be left in.

Mr. Strelow agreed with Mr. Green and felt that defining healthy lifestyles is not any more difficult, mysterious, or subject to abuse than a lot of other things that we routinely talk about requiring. He recommended leaving it in.

Mr. Strelow had to leave the meeting before this item was voted on.

**The motion was called and failed 3-3. Mr. Daltry, Ms. Pierce, and Mr. Green were opposed. Mr. Inge, Mr. Hutchcraft, and Mr. Address were in favor.**

Since the motion failed, Ms. Pierce made a motion to change the verbiage to: "During the development review process, planning staff will ~~consider whether~~ encourage the proposed new development to provide safe opportunities for either a physically active lifestyle or a healthier lifestyle." The motion failed for lack of a second.

**Mr. Daltry made a motion to change the verbiage to: "During the development review process, planning staff will provide applicants with appropriate listings of healthier lifestyle design opportunities for consideration."** Since planning staff is not involved in the development review process, it was decided that the word "planning" would be removed to just say "staff." **The motion was seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft. The motion was called and passed 5-1. Mr. Green was opposed.**

Mr. Green stated his reason for opposition was because there is no encouragement for the developer to do anything with it.

Mr. Inge referred to Policy 4.1.6 on Page 19 of the staff report and noted discussion took place earlier on the definition of "sustainable." Staff is to come back with a definition for the LPA to look at as part of a definition in the Glossary. No motion was necessary.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 4.1.8 on Page 19 of the staff report and wanted to change the language to promote shaded outdoor space.

After further discussion, it was decided that we should encourage shaded and unshaded areas so that it does not sound exclusive. Ms. Pierce suggested changing the language to: "Promote the creation of outdoor activity space, to the extent possible, shaded, within built-up or urban areas in both public projects and private developments."

Mr. Hutchcraft felt the phrase "to the extent possible" means you have to do as much as you can instead of what is financially feasible or what is appropriate for the space. The current verbiage recognizes outdoor activity space. He felt we should rely on professionals and designers and that specificity should be in the Land Development Code not the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Pierce decided to withdraw the motion, but felt staff should address this as part of the Land Development Code.

Mr. O'Connor noted staff would be proposing an urban design element. This issue can be explored more at that time.

**Ms. Pierce referred to Objective 4.3 and Policy 4.3.1 on Page 19 of the staff report. Ms. Pierce made a motion to change the verbiage in Objective 4.3 to "*Lee County will encourage a more diverse and safe selection of travel modes.*" In addition Policy 4.3.1 should read, "...increased safe alternative ...." The motion was seconded by Mr. Daltry. It was called and passed 6-0.**

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to Policy 4.1.7 on Page 19 of the staff report and felt it is a significant limitation as it currently reads. Unless you are doing redevelopment of an existing built up area, you may be significantly limited. What if someone bought a piece of property close by? There are places off Colonial that people would call Greenfield development.

Mr. Inge stated that one consequence could be that vacant land will stay vacant because the only way you can develop a Greenfield site is if you provide connectivity or be considered infill to minimize environmental impacts and maximize these other benefits.

Mr. Daltry felt "*Greenfield development*" should be defined. Greenfield is rural and "built up" is urban. If that is the case, then we want to encourage redevelopment instead of greenfield developments.

**Mr. Andress made a motion to delete Policy 4.1.7, seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Discussion took place on Policy 4.3.3 on Page 20 of the staff report regarding what is meant by "*off-road facilities*". Is it bicycle and walking facilities, 4-wheel drive, BMX bikes, or horses?

**Ms. Pierce made a motion to change the word "*off road*" to "*non-motorized*," seconded by Mr. Daltry. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

**Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 4.3.2 on Page 20 of the staff report and made a motion that we change "*non-automotive*" to "*non-motorized*." The motion was seconded by Mr. Daltry with the proviso that it be changed elsewhere as it applies. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

Due to the number of changes made, **Mr. Andress made a motion to continue CPA2011-00017 to a future meeting before a final recommendation is made to the Board of County Commissioners, seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

### **C. CPA2011-00005 – Economic Element**

Mr. Noble reviewed the staff report and recommendations.

Mr. Daltry reminded staff that the discussion on the definition for "sustainable" applies to this element as well. Staff will need to bring something back for the LPA to review. Staff agreed.

Mr. Inge opened this item for public comment.

Mr. Steven Brodtkin referred to the phrase "*encourage preservation*" in Policy 158.1.7 and felt this was weak language especially since some of those items are essential. He recommended stronger language. He referred to Objective 158.5 on Page 6 of the staff report where it talks about "*expediting the Development Review process.*" He asked how this process will be changed or whether it will be the same process but just re-worded. He also referred to Policy 158.5.4 that states there might be a request for additional information. He noted the reason there are requests for additional information is because when the original requests are made questions are not answered adequately. He asked for specifics on what the role of the Ombudsman encompassed. He also discussed how he might agree with some things in the "tool box" to assist businesses in locating here, but may not agree with all the items in the tool box and that maybe his discussion would need to be with the Board of County Commissioners.

Discussion took place in an effort to answer Mr. Brodtkin's questions.

Mr. Inge referred to Objective 158.1 and the policies below it on Page 8 of the staff report stating it should be part of the Conservation and Coastal element because it involves environmental policies.

Mr. Noble explained it was part of this element because our environment has an impact on our economy. Our destination resort lifestyle brings people to the area meaning the beaches, the Gulf of Mexico, the rivers, the streams, and the sloughs. Because of these attributes of recreation that draw people to the area, it rose to the level of being placed as part of the Economic Element if we are going to have a vibrant environment.

**Mr. Address made a motion to accept the element, CPA2011-00005, pending final review of the entire plan with a corresponding review of transmittal and non-transmittal at that time, seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

#### **Agenda Item 6 – Discussion: Promoting Green Planning Initiatives**

Mr. Inge noted this item was raised by Mr. Strelow who is not currently present. He suggested this item be continued to next month.

**Mr. Daltry made a motion to continue Agenda Item 6 to next month, seconded by Mr. Address. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

#### **Agenda Item 6 - Other Business**

##### **Corkscrew Woods Site Visit Invitation**

Mr. Daltry noted that all LPA members were given an invitation to attend a site visit for the Corkscrew Woods project. He asked for the protocol.

Mr. Inge noted that typically LPA members attend individually and report their findings/information during the discussion processes for that case at the appropriate LPA meeting.

## **Community Planning Lists for Zonings, Rezonings, and Comp Plan Amendments**

Mr. Andress discussed the community planning lists maintained and used by the County with regards to zoning, rezoning, and comp plan cases. He requested that LPA members be added to these lists so they receive notifications of these various cases along with the public. He noted the public views the LPA as their representatives for the area.

Mr. Inge made this a formal request. Staff stated they would take care of it.

## **2010 Census Data**

Mr. O'Connor distributed some census data requested during last month's meeting.

Due to a question by Mr. Green, Mr. O'Connor clarified this was 2010 census data.

Mr. Inge stated this census data gave the LPA something to review. He noted the LPA may have questions on this data at a future meeting once they have had a chance to review it.

## **Agenda Item 7 – Adjournment**

The next meeting of the Local Planning Agency is scheduled for Monday, April 23, 2012, at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Chambers, Old Lee County Courthouse, 2120 Main Street, Fort Myers, FL 33901. The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.