

**MINUTES REPORT
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
October 28, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Noel Andress
Steve Brodtkin
Wayne Daltry
Jim Green (Chair)

Mitch Hutchcraft
Ann Pierce (Vice Chair)
Roger Strelow

STAFF PRESENT:

Brandon Dunn, Planning
Kathie Ebaugh, Planning
Michael Jacob, Managing Asst. Cty. Atty.

Janet Miller, Recording Secretary
Matt Noble, Planning
Paul O'Connor, Planning Director

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

Mr. Green, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Chambers of the Old Lee County Courthouse, 2120 Main Street, Fort Myers, FL 33901.

Mr. Michael Jacob, 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 – September 23, 2013

Mr. Daltry made a motion to approve the September 23, 2013 meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Strelow. The motion was called and passed 7-0.

Agenda Item 5 – County Initiated 2013 Regular Amendments

- A. **CPA2013-00003 – RSW Revised Airport Layout Plan – Map 3F** – Amend Lee Plan Map 3F, the Southwest Florida International Airport, RSW, Airport Layout Plan, to reflect the revised Airport Layout Plan approved by the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. Blackwell reviewed the staff report and recommendations.

The LPA had no questions of staff.

Mr. Green opened this item for public comment. No input was received and the public segment was closed.

Mr. Andress made a motion to transmit CPA2013-00003, seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft. The motion was called and passed 7-0.

- B. **CPA2013-00005 – University Community DRI Requirement** – Amend Policy 18.1.5, Policy 18.1.16, and Policy 18.2.2 to make the Lee Plan consistent with State requirements that prohibit local governments from requiring Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review for projects that do not meet or exceed state established thresholds.

Mr. Noble distributed an Errata Sheet to the LPA.

Mr. Dunn explained that Mr. Noble was distributing an Errata Sheet that outlines a small change to this amendment. He then reviewed the staff report and recommendations.

Mr. Address asked Mr. Jacobs to educate the LPA on what was taking place with Grandeza and the Miromar Lakes bubble plan in relation to Grandeza zoning case. In other words, if this plan amendment is adopted, what impact would that have on Grandeza and future DRIs. He expressed concerns with the lack of public input into this process for the future.

Mr. Jacob stated that this amendment and the law that passed in 2011 will have no affect on DRIs that currently exist. It states that if you are not required to go through the DRI review and you do not meet their thresholds that are provided in the state law, then local jurisdictions cannot make you go through it. He referred the discussion about the bubble plan to planning staff.

Mr. Noble reviewed the specifics on the bubble plan.

Mr. Address asked what opportunity a community might have if they want to be part of the review process for the actual development that occurs on that site. What opportunity will they have to make a public comment on this bubble plan?

Mr. Noble felt they were having a lot of public comment through the rezoning hearing in front of the Hearing Examiner. This case will ultimately go before the Board of County Commissioners. There are a series of conditions that are being created to address the community's concern, such as height within certain distances, uses, etc. that will all be part of the conditioning of the rezoning request.

Mr. Address stated this was the time to put some conditions with the approval of this amendment: 1) Any DRI that is covered by the new rule change must, for any future amendment, be required to have a public information workshop; 2) Any DRI that is covered by the new rule and that relies on the final plan approval per its original Development Order in the planned development approval - if said DRI has been expanded in area or intensity, the DRI is prohibited from relying on the FPA for the planned development and the Notice of Proposed Change Review (NOPC) for the DRI site areas and our additional entitlements that were added after original approvals; and, 3) All reviews will be based on the current Land Development Code rules.

Mr. Strelow gave specifics about the community of Grandezza explaining that we have a large DRI that encircles the University. At one point, at the southern end where you have proximity right across the property line with a major gated community Grandeza, the plan was to have golf courses and things of that nature. For understandable reasons, the University wanted to develop the southern end of its property more. They got the adjacent land developer, Miromar Lakes, to agree to flip where the golf course and that type of development was going to be and bring commercial development to the south. Residents in Grandeza who had envisioned when they bought their property that there would be a golf course across the street are now facing the prospect of much more intensive and intrusive development. As such, they want to make sure they have adequate opportunity as plans get more and more specific to be able to participate and be heard in trying to ameliorate the potential adverse affects.

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

Mr. Daltry stated his concerns were that he did not know where Area 9 is located.

Mr. O'Connor stated Area 9 is also known as the Alico West property. It was the piece that was added from the DRGR into the University Community about 4 or 5 years ago.

Mr. Daltry stated there was mention of the 951 extension in this amendment. It is a road that connects Alico and Corkscrew. He asked if it was named something different now.

Mr. O'Connor stated that to date, no one had renamed it.

Mr. Daltry suggested dedicating the right-of-way for whichever facility follows between the two (Alico and Corkscrew Road).

Mr. Brodtkin was supportive of Mr. Address's comments and did not feel it was a satisfactory public input process as far as this development is concerned. He noted there are times when the public cannot attend the Hearing Examiner meetings or the Commission meetings.

Mr. Address referred to Item 6 on Page 2 of 7 where it talks about 40 acres dedicated to FGCU becoming part of the FGCU campus and development. He was aware that the University wants to have student housing on this 40 acre site.

Mr. Noble stated he had not heard something definitive from the university as to what they are going to develop on that property.

Mr. Address read where it said, "*...will not be calculated against the maximum residential unit count, nor maximum commercial square footage otherwise allowed.*" He noted the University already has whatever density they could get on the property and now they are being given an additional 40 acres in addition to the previous density given to Alico West. He did not feel that was acceptable.

Mr. Noble did not see this as an issue because there are still 1,600 units that have not been allocated anywhere in the University Community.

Mr. O'Connor stated that this particular amendment is to bring us into compliance with a recent change to the statute. If the LPA wants to revisit Goal 18 as well as what the requirements are for the University and for Area 9 then it would be an entirely new plan amendment. Some of the language being proposed today to resolve this would need to be vetted and would most likely be included in the Land Development Code instead of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hutchcraft had concerns with the language proposed by Mr. Address because it might potentially impact the vesting of other DRI projects. If a project is a DRI, they would still be required to go through the process and be evaluated as a DRI. He did not see how this amendment would change that. He also did not see how this would change the public approval process since the project would still get scheduled for a public hearing. **He made a motion to recommend the BOCC transmit CPA2013-00005 as proposed by staff including the Errata sheet. The motion failed for lack of a second.**

Ms. Pierce referred to the third line of Policy 18.2.2 on Page 2 of 7 that says, “*Predominant land uses within this area are expected to be residential, commercial, office, public and quasi-public, recreation, and research and development parks.*” She suggested deleting the word “*parks*” and substituting it with the word “*activities.*”

Mr. O’Connor stated this particular amendment was done in response to a modification of state statutes. Staff did not reopen the language for the University Community. There will be an opportunity to change the language through the Evaluation and Appraisal Report.

Mr. Andress stated there was a difference in having the public speak at a rezoning hearing versus a community group meeting. The difference is that the rezoning hearings are a formal quasi-judicial type meeting versus coming to an informal community group meeting for a presentation. Although this is not required of DRIs today, this would be an opportunity to put that type of requirement in place.

Mr. O’Connor clarified that even though there is language to that affect in the various community plans, it is not in place for the University Community because they do not have a San Carlos Planning Community. Therefore, there is no requirement for a local public information meeting in this area of Lee County.

Mr. Daltry asked that his comment about 951 be considered as an Errata based on circumstances because if you do not have a 951, then this is mute.

Mr. Andress made a motion to recommend that the BOCC transmit CPA2013-05 with the following condition: 1) that any future amendments be required to have a public informational workshop held in that community, seconded by Mr. Daltry.

Mr. Hutchcraft cautioned the LPA that they are placing a new requirement on approved vested DRIs. It will require a particular project to have to hold a public workshop where no other project in the San Carlos community is required to. Therefore, he could not support the amendment.

Discussion ensued on whether this should apply county wide versus for the University Community only.

Mr. Strelow clarified that no one is trying to get any action by the Board to deal with the merits of the current dispute between and community and the development south of the University. What is being requested is that the interests that will be affected, such as Grandezza have a reasonable opportunity for input and that no action on this matter would preclude that. The action being requested is that an opportunity be added to allow for that. **He suggested that a possible alternative would be to make a proposal that it be done for this instance. In the future, staff might consider making an amendment that would apply on a broader basis. However, this action would be for the University specifically.**

Mr. Andress amended his motion that the LPA recommend the BOCC transmit CPA2013-05 with the following condition: 1) that any future amendments in the University Community, be required to have a public information workshop held in that community. Mr. Daltry agreed to the amendment.

Mr. Hutchcraft clarified that the LPA was proposing a requirement in a community planning area for which the citizens of that community planning area have not requested. To him, we were trying to retroactively fix a problem that uniquely exists to this one example. He felt it was inappropriate.

Mr. Strelow stated there are thousands of people in Estero who are concerned that they will not have adequate input. He clarified that the intent is not to dictate anything for San Carlos, but to protect the interests of the people of Estero.

The motion was called and passed 5-2. Mr. Hutchcraft and Ms. Pierce were opposed.

Mr. Daltry stated that if we are trying to discuss the best way to vet this issue county-wide, we should start looking at the Future Land Use Element where some opportunity for that might exist.

Ms. Pierce agreed with this and stated she voted against the motion because of its specificity on the University Community.

Mr. Brodtkin stated the Communities element might be another place for it.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he felt it should be in the Land Development Code since that is where it outlines the process.

Mr. Daltry stated there could still be a policy in the Comprehensive Plan that directs it to the Land Development Code.

Agenda Item 6 – New Horizon 2035: Plan Amendments

A. CPA2011-00011 – Intergovernmental Coordination

Ms. Ebaugh gave a brief overview of this item and noted this was a second review since it previously went before the LPA.

Jennifer Hagen, on behalf of the Sustainability Advisory Committee, reviewed comments by CSAC for all three elements. She distributed a packet. These comments were made by CSAC and the new Horizon 2035 working group from 2013 (attached).

Due to a question by Mr. Daltry, Ms. Hagen explained that “*food desert*” referred to areas in the county and other cities and counties worldwide that have limited access to fresh produce or food. In terms of walkability, the immediate neighborhood for those people is a far reach for them to have access to fresh produce and food.

Mr. Green opened it for public comment. No public input was received.

Mr. Hutchcraft made a motion to recommend transmittal of CPA2011-00011, seconded by Mr. Andress.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.2.3 on Page 3 and asked why stormwater management would not be included in this policy as it is an important parameter in the community.

Ms. Ebaugh stated that no one had asked for that previously. However, it could be included.

Ms. Pierce asked that stormwater management and maintenance and on-going improvement of water quality be added to the policy.

The motioner and seconder agreed to include that in their motion.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.2.8 on Page 3 and asked if it was too narrow. She suggested saying “*planning, construction, and maintenance of innerconnected stormwater management systems.*”

Mr. Hutchcraft suggested simplifying it by saying “*stormwater management.*”

The motioner and seconder agreed.

Mr. Address asked if we needed TMDL’s mentioned in the document, such as Policy 1.2.8.

Mr. O’Connor felt it was adequately covered in the Conservation and Coastal Management Element.

The final motion would be to recommend transmittal of CPA2011-00011 with a change to Policies 1.2.3 and 1.2.8 to include a reference to stormwater management.

The motion was called and passed 7-0.

B. CPA2011-00005 – Economic

Ms. Ebaugh gave a brief overview of this amendment.

Mr. Address referred to Goal 1 and asked for a definition for “*a high quality of life.*”

Ms. Ebaugh stated this term could be changed if that is what the LPA decides. It is an individualized item, not standardized. A high quality of life will be different for each person.

Mr. Address stated his concern was that we maintain a high quality of environment which is needed for our economy.

Ms. Ebaugh stated the issue of the environment is covered under Goal 2 on Page 6.

Mr. Daltry suggested changing “*jobs*” to “*meaningful work.*” In planning terms, we should try to promote and maintain a society by which each individual can achieve their fullest potential.

Mr. Brodtkin referred to the section that mentions “*attraction of targeted employers.*” He felt that was general and did not give specifics on how this would be accomplished.

Ms. Ebaugh stated staff did not get too specific in this element because things can change over time. As different industries have different means of going after those businesses, staff felt this was more of an operating procedure rather than something that would be in policy.

Mr. Brodtkin stated he had concerns in the past with the ways in which Lee County sometimes attracts these targeted employers.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 1.2.1 on Page 3 and asked what the timelines were for this as there can easily be conflicts between short term fiscal benefit and long term benefit or deficit.

Ms. Ebaugh felt this document as a whole deals with short and long term policies.

Mr. Noble agreed with Ms. Ebaugh and stated it was an ongoing concern. He noted a lot of this is interacting with other advisory groups such as the Horizon Council and other people who are actively involved in advising the county on economic policy. He stated it was a difficult issue because the county is open for business. If a developer's project is evaluated and they meet the requirements of the Land Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan, they get their permits. The county does not weigh whether they have given out too many permits for that particular month.

Ms. Pierce stated she would like to see some of that language in here directly avowing some allegiance to long term benefit as she has seen it done in older counties. She felt it was a value statement that needed to be stated more clearly.

Mr. Green suggested language be added in Goal 1.

Ms. Ebaugh stated staff would look into that further to see how it could be addressed.

Mr. Brodtkin referred to the same Policy 1.2.1 where it mentions removing impediments to fiscally beneficial development. He asked if that meant that the primary way the county evaluates some of these developments is whether they are fiscally beneficial.

Ms. Ebaugh stated it is not the primary way, but that this is also broader than looking at a specific development project. It involves looking at how we do business as a whole.

Mr. Brodtkin asked why we were removing the term "*where appropriate*" as there will be places where this might not be appropriate.

Ms. Ebaugh stated it was recommended by one of the advisory groups. When the county evaluates something, they review both the appropriateness and the inappropriateness of the project. She did not believe it made much difference in having the term "*where appropriate*" removed.

Mr. O'Connor stated that one of the problems with reviewing different elements separately is that it is difficult to see it as a whole. Although the county has an aggressive economic element, they also have other aggressive elements such as environmental and complete streets. This economic element is only one small piece of the whole plan.

Mr. Andress referred to Policy 2.1.3 on Page 7 and asked who would establish and implement this strategic plan.

Ms. Ebaugh stated the strategic plan is already adopted and established by the Lee County Visitors and Conventions Bureau and adopted by the BOCC. Many of these policies are reflective of the language in that strategic plan.

Mr. Strelow referred to Policy 1.2.4 on Page 3 where it says will take action to "*...reduce requests for additional information and decrease application processing time.*" He asked if there were places in the plan that would clearly provide the offset. For instance, places that say we want to maximize public input and maximize adequate information.

Ms. Ebaugh stated that would be included as part of the Communities, Future Land Use, and Transportation elements.

Mr. Daltry referred to Policy 1.2.1 on Page 3 and noted that “*fiscally beneficial*” is a big impediment that would be no small challenge. He suggested there be a policy to promote, require, or encourage an independent transparent fiscal impact review process.

Mr. Hutchcraft agreed that we want to have a fair and balanced economic analysis. He agreed with the concept, but was not sure the Comprehensive Plan was the right location for it. He referred to Policy 1.6.5 that is being proposed for removal on Page 6 dealing with Agriculture. Mr. Hutchcraft agreed with the conclusion of the paragraph which states, “*Since Lee County does not regulate agricultural lands, staff is not certain how such a policy would be applied.*” He understood why staff recommended removing this section. However, he gave examples of why he felt a policy like this might be appropriate such as farmworker housing or the construction of a processing facility.

Ms. Pierce referred to the recommendations by CSAC. They had recommended adding Policy 158.1.9 which dealt with encouraging a diverse mix of housing types, sizes, prices, and rents by maintaining mixed use land use categories. She recommended something along those lines go in between Policy 1.3.1 and Policy 1.3.2. She suggested changing the wording to begin with “In recognition of changing demographics and market trends, Lee County will encourage...”

Ms. Ebaugh stated that was an existing policy that was removed when staff revised the entire element in coordination with CSAC. However, she stated it could be brought back.

Ms. Pierce referred to Policy 2.1.9 on Page 8 where it lists a couple of different types of tourism businesses such as “*ecotourism*” and “*agri-tourism.*” As mentioned by Mr. Hutchcraft in different elements, staff should either list everything or not list any of them. For instance, she would like to see “*bicycle tourism*” added.

Ms. Ebaugh felt it best to remove the listing because someone will always think something was missed. The “*natural assets*” talks about everything else.

Mr. Green opened this item for public input. No additional input was received other than earlier comments by Jennifer Hagen on behalf of CSAC.

Mr. Daltry proposed that a new Policy 1.2.5 be added to establish a transparent fiscal impact review system.

Mr. Andress made a motion to recommend transmittal of CPA2011-00005 (Economic Element) with the proposed change of Policy 1.2.5, and changes suggested by Ms. Pierce (the one to be located between Policy 1.3.1 and Policy 1.3.2 dealing with housing, seconded by Mr. Daltry. The motion was called and passed 7-0.

C. CPA2011-00010 – Housing

Ms. Sajgo stated she felt the housing element addressed most of the issues brought up by the Community Sustainability Advisory Committee. She noted a correction to Policy 1.1.7 which should say “*educational facilities*” instead of “*schools.*”

Ms. Pierce asked why a housing and transportation index was not included. She noted that the Center for Neighborhood Technology produces one every year which is nationally recognized and is seen being incorporated more often in national policies. She felt we needed to add a policy indicating the need due to the added burden of transportation costs particularly on low income residents. Staff could use the H & T index from the Center of Neighborhood Technology or any other H & T index.

Due to a question by Mr. O'Connor, Ms. Pierce clarified that the H & I T index should be included in any evaluation.

Ms. Sajgo suggested adding a policy to develop a housing and transportation index for Lee County. Once staff has the index, it will be easier to figure out how it could be used. She suggested having this policy after Objective 1.1. It could be Policy 1.1.5 *"to develop a housing and transportation index for Lee County."* She noted the county is very short of funding, but this would be a good thing to at least work towards.

Ms. Pierce noted this national database, which would be something staff could start with, is becoming important in regards to applying for grant monies. If Lee County is going to be competitive, they have to get up to speed with being able to provide those numbers.

Mr. Green opened this item for public input. No additional input was received other than earlier comments by Jennifer Hagen on behalf of CSAC.

Mr. Andress made a motion to transmit CPA2011-10 (housing element) with the one recommended change in creating Policy 1.1.15 about developing a housing and transportation index, seconded by Mr. Daltry. The motion was called and passed 7-0.

Agenda Item 7 - Other Business

Cayo Costa Properties

Mr. Andress stated he had received many calls regarding the bulk sale of some properties on Cayo Costa. At a public meeting, people were told these sites are no longer viable and the state is concerned because they acquired these sites. They initially had a right to build a house on them, but are now being told these properties have no value. If you look on the Future Land Use Map, the category has been changed to Conservation.

Mr. Noble stated these properties were amended to the Conservation Lands Future Land Use category partly based on the ownership. The State gave permission to do this. A letter was originally sent from Lee County to the Department of Environmental Protection asking them their future intention of those properties. At that time, their intention was to hold these properties for conservation purposes. They were asked if they would they be agreeable to the county amending their future land use designation into the conservation land use category and the response came back from the state that the state was agreeable and that those lands were being held for conservation purposes.

Mr. Andress asked for clarification that as it stands today, those lots that are marked for disposal are not buildable.

Mr. Noble stated this was correct. They are not buildable if they are surplus by the State. He stated an amendment would be initiated by the State or whoever ends up with the properties.

Mr. O'Connor noted that there was language in the administrative chapter of the plan that says if you have a lot that was lawfully created at the time that it was created then you have the right, as a minimum, to put a single family home on that lot.

Research Diamond Area

Mr. Andress stated he had attended an excellent presentation by the group that did the AIA report about the Research Diamond area out at the University.

Discussion took place about whether the County would take steps to incorporate some of the ideas of the study and if changes would be made to allow the type of development they propose for the area surrounding the University and Airport.

Mr. Daltry referred to some information included in the meeting packet that was forwarded by Ms. Pierce regarding the Research Diamond area. He asked Ms. Pierce to discuss it.

Ms. Pierce discussed the details of the presentation with the LPA and staff. The report by the consultants will not be ready for 3-4 months. In the meantime, she hoped the county would continue this process on a more formal basis so that the issue does not drop and we can keep momentum. If a recording was available for that presentation, she asked that it be forwarded to the LPA members.

Agenda Item 8 – Adjournment

The next Local Planning Agency meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 4, 2013, at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Chambers, Old Lee County Courthouse, 2120 Main Street, Fort Myers, FL 33901.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Memorandum
FROM THE
COUNTY MANAGER'S OFFICE
COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
239-533-2221
Fax 485-2262

Date: October 23, 2013

To: Local Planning Agency

From: Community Sustainability
Advisory Committee

RE: Lee Plan Elements: Intergovernmental Coordination, Housing, and Economic Development

On October 16, 2013, the Community Sustainability Advisory Committee reviewed the following elements to provide final comments and recommendations related to the committee's goal of promoting community sustainability.

- Intergovernmental Coordination
- Housing
- Economic Development

The Committee's May 16, 2012 recommendations have been incorporated into the Intergovernmental Coordination Element. Most of the Committee's September 26, 2012 Housing Element and April 18, 2012 Economic Element recommendations have also been included in the most recent draft documents.

Regarding the Housing Element, the Committee recommended adding the term "resource efficient" to *Goal 1: Meeting Housing Needs*. As part of encouraging sustainable development practices outlined in 1.1.7, The Committee also recommended adding the term, "educational facilities" under Policy 1.1.7.b, emphasizing the need to work jointly with the School District and other entities to promote safety and accessibility to educational facilities in Lee County. The Committee also recommended adding a policy 1.1.7.i to address access to healthful food using USDA definitions of food deserts.

In the Economic Element, the Committee recommended deleting the term, "tourist and retirement" in Policy 2.2.1 to include all current and future economic drivers in the county.

Attached you will find Committee recommendations regarding the elements listed above from 2012, and comments and recommendations made by the Community Sustainability Advisory Committee and New Horizon 2035 Working Group from October 2013. A committee member will continue to attend LPA meetings to discuss remaining elements in the coming months.

Please let us know if you have questions.

Cc: Roger Desjarlais
Holly Schwartz
Pete Winton

Doug Meurer
Mary Gibbs
Paul O'Connor

Housing Element Recommendation from 2012 Community Sustainability Advisory Committee

Committee Meeting Date: September 26, 2012

Committee Recommendations

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. RECOMMENDATION: Review this element and other related elements to ensure support for alternative housing construction/structures, e.g. modular or pre-fabricated homes.
2. RECOMMENDATION: Review this element and other related elements (Community Well-Being & Safety) to identify an appropriate place to address Special Housing Needs related to Emergency Preparedness. Consider identifying opportunities to track where people with special needs live so they can be assisted in the event of an emergency or natural disaster.
3. Policy 1.1.7.b - The county will encourage proposals for affordable housing that are consistent with the use and density provisions of this Plan and associated land development regulations. That encourage affordable housing proposals provided such locations provide sustainable development practices including:
 - b. Location on sites with access to Are provided full urban services and facilities including water and sewer, mass transit, parks and open spaces and libraries
 - RECOMMENDATION: Schools should also be added to the list of sites with access to urban services and facilities.
4. Policy 1.1.7.h (currently formatted as last paragraph under this policy) - Incorporation of green building techniques such as but not limited to including energy efficient construction, appropriate solar exposure, air circulation, and the use of natural shading. (Added by Ordinance No. 07-17)
 - RECOMMENDATION: Format to label the paragraph under 1.1.7.g. as 1.1.7.h. and consider adding techniques that support water conservation or efficiency, use of reclaimed water, and use of long-lasting materials made from renewable resources.
 - Consider changing "neighborhoods" to a more suited word for all pedestrian friendly walk-ability
5. Policy 1.1.1.f. – need to reword "Mixing land uses"
6. Policy 1.2.2 (e) sounds like they want to reduce shared parking; it reads as if it needs a comma
7. Policy 1.3.3 - The county will provide counseling services to very-low, low- lower and moderate-income households and persons who have special housing needs participating participants in county any of the Department's housing programs, including the homeless assistance. The counseling may include financial guidance, housing maintenance information, and consumer advice to assist households seeking affordable, and standard housing, Lee County will continue to offer home buyer training and also information about support services such as day care, emergency shelter, food and clothing and employment services to program beneficiaries. (Amended by Ordinance No. 9-09, 00-22, 7-17)
 - RECOMMENDATION: Consider adding language that supports creating mechanisms for accountability in the provision of counseling services to promote the success of persons served and program efficiency. This may be accomplished by adding language that speaks to best practices and promoting long-term self-sufficiency
8. Policy 1.9.7 - County land development regulations will implement standards in land development regulations to protect aesthetic qualities and the physical natural environment, while providing incentives for residential development designs which that

emphasize energy-efficient construction, appropriate solar exposure, air circulation, and the use of natural shading. (Amended by Ordinance No. 00-22)

- RECOMMENDATION: Consider adding techniques that support water conservation or efficiency, use of reclaimed water, and use of long-lasting materials made from renewable resources.
9. The first sentence under Goals, Objectives, and Policies should be revised to clarify this is where we want to go; this is our goal ; the way it's written it sounds like it's what is happening now; it contradicts what we are currently doing.
 10. Policy 3.2.1. Clarify to say "reduce transportation energy use"
 11. Policy 3.2.2.g. "maintain or improve natural terrain"
 12. Policy 3.1.8.e. revise with "Maximize the efficient uses of natural resources"
 13. Policy 3.2.2.d. consider using "harmful materials" verses "chemicals/toxic"
 14. Policy 3.2.3.c. minimize harmful chemicals and toxins

Economic Element Recommendation from 2012 Community Sustainability Advisory Committee

Committee Meeting Date: April 18, 2012

Committee Recommendations

1. Add titles to the objectives in this element
2. Objective 158.1: Remove " existing retirements, recreation, and tourist oriented" and "these and other"; Here or elsewhere, consider adding language that supports the desire to attract businesses and employment opportunities that align with the county's sustainability goals/clean economy.
3. 158.1.4: Replace "strong" with "effective"
4. 158.1.5: Broaden to bring up to date (recycling is now status quo) and better convey desire to promote the beautification and stewardship
5. Policy 158.1.9: This element should speak to the economic value added by implementing complete streets and promoting mixed use centers. This policy could be broadened or this could be added elsewhere as appropriate
6. 158.2.4: Broaden to promote sustainable tourism (eco-, agritourism, etc.) opportunities that promote the distinction of our unique environment and communities.

Intergovernmental Element Recommendation from 2012 Community Sustainability Advisory Committee

Committee Meeting Date: May 16, 2012

Committee Recommendations

1. Add new policy regarding existing efforts to make interlocal efforts transparent including placement of interlocal agreements online.
2. Add new policy aimed at updates to joint planning area (JPA).
3. Policy 1.1.2: Review this policy in light of state legislation regarding development coordination with permitting of obtained through other state agencies (HB 503 signed by Governor 5/4/12).

4. Policy 1.1.3(b): Add recognition of need to both expand and retrofit sidewalks, bikeways, and transit routes.
5. Policy 1.2.11: Delete list of identified agencies as it is not inclusive and may limit our scope of partners.
6. Ask the planning staff to identify ways to promote public-private partnerships to facilitate the development of public neighborhood and parks.

COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 14, 2013

The Working Group reviewed the Housing, Economic Development, and Intergovernmental Coordination elements with assistance from planning staff.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION ELEMENT

Staff noted no major changes were made since the previous version of this element. Working Group noted that everything the Committee suggested was addressed and incorporated. No recommendations made.

HOUSING ELEMENT

Recommendation #1: Goal 1, add the term “energy efficient”.

“GOAL 1: MEETING HOUSING NEEDS. Achieve a volume of decent, energy efficient, safe, and sanitary at affordable costs...”.

Recommendation #2: Under Policy 1.1.7b, add “education facilities”.

Policy 1.1.7.b “Location on sites with access to urban services and facilities including water and sewer, mass transit, parks and open spaces, and libraries, and educational facilities”.

Group notes Policy 1.1.7 states, “Encourage proposals for innovative, diverse and affordable housing that are consistent with the use and density provisions of this Plan and associated land development regulations. Promote sustainable development practices including:”, demonstrating this is a joint issue between the County and School District. Although school assignments are made by the School District, and due to School Choice proximity to a school does not guarantee access to a particular school, the County should promote safe access for students, parents, and community members to all educational facilities.

Recommendation #3: Policy 1.1.7: create additional policy 1.1.7.i that addresses access to healthful food using USDA definitions of food deserts.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

Recommendation 4: Policy 2.2.1 – delete the word, “and retirement”

“POLICY 2.2.1: Promote the beautification and stewardship of the county’s natural resources in order to support and maintain the county’s ~~tourist and retirement~~ economy”

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

LPA will address these elements on Monday, October 28, 2013 at 8:30 AM. Working Group member, Jennifer Hagen is likely available to attend. She will confirm on Wednesday's Committee meeting.

Staff suggests Ms. Hagen review the committee's previous recommendation and a brief overview of how they were incorporated. Staff will create a memo and bullet points for the LPA meeting.

Given the short timeframe for providing final input into the New Horizon 2035 amendment process, the Working Group stressed that the Committee should review the elements before the working group meetings, which take place the Monday before the Wednesday Community Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting. If members have recommendations on the elements, they should be sent to the sub-committee for discussion. This will be announced as a reminder at Wednesday's meeting.

Working group will receive the next set of elements by November 8th and possibly one additional element on November 13th. This will give the Working Group ample time to review the elements.