

**MINUTES REPORT
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
March 24, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Noel Andress (Chair)	Mitch Hutchcraft
Dennis Church	Jim Ink
Jim Green	Rick Joyce (Vice Chair)
	David Mulicka

STAFF PRESENT:

Brandon Dunn, Planning	Michael Jacob, Managing Asst. Cty. Atty.
Kathie Ebaugh, Planning	Janet Miller, Recording Secretary
Andy Getch, DOT	Paul O'Connor, Planning Director

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order, Review of Affidavit of Publication/Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Andress, 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 – Public Forum - None

Agenda Item 3 – Approval of Minutes – February 27, 2014

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the February 27th meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Ink. The motion was called and passed 6-0. Mr. Joyce was absent for this vote.

Agenda Item 4 – New Horizon 2035: Plan Amendments

A. CPA2011-00013 Transportation Element

Mr. Andress noted that this item was continued from last month's meeting.

Mr. Hutchcraft noted that at the last couple of meetings he had requested, with the LPA's support, an interpretation of some policies to determine if they were consistent with the Community Planning Act of 2011. The LPA had asked both Planning staff and the legal staff to address it. He asked if staff had any such interpretation to provide to the LPA.

Mr. O'Connor stated he did not.

Mr. Hutchcraft stated that without the interpretation, he was concerned this element was in conflict with the Community Planning Act of 2011. He noted the LPA had moved forward with a number of other elements while noting that objection. He was concerned that as a result of that the Transportation Element would be internally inconsistent with those other elements. He felt it would be inappropriate to move forward with this item until the LPA receives staff's response.

After a request by Mr. Address as to why an interpretation is not being provided, Mr. Jacob stated the County was in the middle of lawsuits on this particular matter and threats of lawsuits from a certain individual and their company. Therefore, the Attorney's office cannot provide any more information on this other than what Mr. O'Connor stated on this matter at a previous meeting.

Mr. Address noted he had previously asked Mr. O'Connor about concurrency in regards to Pine Island. At that time, the LPA was told staff believed there were adequate provisions and adequate uniqueness regarding Pine Island that would support leaving that language in.

Mr. O'Connor stated that was correct and that his position had not changed.

Mr. Address asked if there were adequate provisions to allow for a special exception.

Mr. O'Connor stated he would not say there were adequate provisions for a special exception but in Lee County staff realizes that different areas of the county have different interests and needs. The County has established 22 planning communities. There are also actual goals and objectives that have been adopted into the plan that are specific to specific areas of the county and do not apply in other areas of the county, which is the situation on Pine Island. He stated it was unfortunate that this particular objective in Pine Island uses the word "*concurrency*" because it is not a concurrency issue. It is an issue that has to do with preplatted lots that exist. There are approximately 6,000-7,000 of them on the island and the Plan is concerned with the rights of the people that own those already platted lots to have an ability to build on them. There is an issue with hurricane evacuation because of the constraints of Pine Island Road through Matlacha and staff has explored that situation many times. Although there have been changes in the law, staff believes the provisions on Pine Island deal more with growth management than they do with concurrency. Mr. O'Connor noted the Plan would be sent to the State who will review it for consistency with 163. The State may at that time make recommendations in their ORC report. The County also has a Concurrency amendment going to the State for review. If the State makes recommendations, staff will try to address them. For now, staff believes we are following the law and are on solid ground.

Based on this response, Mr. Address agreed to move forward on this item.

Ms. Ebaugh and Mr. Dunn presented this item and discussed the schedule for the maps.

Mr. Green appreciated that when staff brought the map to the LPA in the past, the map clearly showed where the changes were, which made the review easier. He asked for the upcoming map to be depicted the same way.

Mr. Rick Joyce noted there were several areas in the Transportation Element that deal with stormwater. He reminded staff that at the last meeting, he had expressed concerns that the County was not doing a good job as far as addressing the design of stormwater systems on transportation corridors. Although some changes in the language have taken place, he hoped for stronger language. The latest draft has verbiage such as "*optimizing stormwater attenuation and groundwater recharge,*" which are two aspects of stormwater design. However, the County needs to have a more integrated water management system design as part of these stormwater systems along roadways dealing particularly with bio-retention and bio-filtration so that water quality is addressed as part of those system designs. He hoped to see more work done on Policy 2.4.1.g., Objective 3.3 and Policy 3.3.1.i.

Mr. Address stated the County could do an innovative design with a park like setting with some shade trees and benches where the public could have an opportunity to use these sites. However, they are currently fenced off from the public, not maintained, and in a state of disrepair. He felt a policy was needed to allow us to get to the point where this could be done.

Mr. Ink stated he was in agreement but wanted to make sure the Comprehensive Plan stayed generic enough that it is an encouraged interaction or integration of community development parks.

Mr. Address was in agreement and stated it should also be incentivized if it is going to be for a public benefit.

Mr. O'Connor stated that just as we have "*Complete Streets*" we need to have "*Complete Stormwater Management*." There might be times it would not be useful to have parks around a stormwater retention area, whereas in other areas it could be a positive feature. It needs to be looked at in context of where it is located and what benefits it could have. Some concerns are: 1) there are a lot of rules and regulations that make it harder to be creative with these projects; 2) cost; and, 3) some of the major roadways are state roads. Although we could do a much better job on addressing stormwater, the concept is being addressed in the Plan. However, we are not at the point where we can get too specific.

Mr. Ink recommended the language could say, "*Encourage the integration of stormwater elements with community use where applicable.*"

Mr. Church referred to the chart on the top of Page 4 that has the mode priority preferences and it identifies "*Pedestrian*" as the number 1 preferred for all urban land use categories. He asked how many acres all the urban categories represent.

Mr. Ebaugh clarified that urban land use categories are not the same as urban areas. Urban land use categories are only the top three, so it is the urban core (the urban places and urban neighborhoods land use categories). This does not address Suburban or economic. She noted staff would have the acreages at next month's meeting.

Mr. Church asked if this chart would have an impact on funding for transportation.

Mr. Getch noted there were policies in the Capital Improvement Element and the Transportation Element that direct and prioritize funds based on hurricane evacuation facilities and Urban, Suburban and Rural areas.

Mr. Church referred to Policy 2.1.6 on Page 2, which talks about a multimodal methodology being in place by 2016. He asked if that was the equivalent of how you measure impacts for normal transportation with vehicles. Also, is there a negative consequence if it is not in place by 2016?

Mr. Getch stated the answer to the first question is "*yes.*" As far as the negative consequence if it is not in place by 2016, Mr. Getch stated the County was required by Florida Statute for all public facilities, not just transportation, to have a level of service measure. The level of service measure is prescribed in the documentation by FDOT, which this policy is referring to. Staff will be working with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) as part of the long range transportation planning process. The MPO is required to have a major update to the Long Range Transportation Plan completed by the end of next year (2015). Therefore, staff will know before the end of 2016 what direction that plan is going in.

Mr. Ink noted we were using the highway capacity manual and going to the multi-modal system. He asked if there were other alternatives to looking at traffic in case MPO decides multi-modal is not it.

Mr. Getch stated there were things being developed and the Highway Capacity Manual is evolving as there is a 2010 version. It is a publication that comes out every 10 years. It has gone through a major change in movement towards multi-modal.

Mr. Ink felt some flexibility should be placed in Policy 2.1.6 in case what we are currently working on does not work. He noted there were some municipalities/jurisdictions that are not thrilled with multi-modal.

Mr. Church referred to Policy 3.3.2, which talks about expanding roads through areas of ecological concern. It states that the only way it can happen is if it is determined to be an “*overriding public interest*.” He felt a definition of that would be needed and that it should be clarified.

Mr. Andress referred to Objective 1.4 Rail Corridor on Page 3 and noted the recent United States Supreme Court decision regarding rails and rail corridors. The Supreme Court has ruled that when a railroad vacates that easement, the easement goes back to the person that was the owner of record at the time of the original grant of the easement. People want bike paths and trails on many of these corridors, but now, they will need to buy the land for that to happen. He felt this might have an impact on Objective 1.4.

Mr. Church referred to Policy 2.1.1 dealing with Level of Service E as the minimum LOS for principal and minor arterials and major collectors. He asked if this meant there was no level of service specification for minor collectors or local roads.

Mr. Getch stated this was correct.

Mr. Church asked why all the state roads have a higher level of service on their roads than our roads.

Mr. Getch stated this was the standard that the State has prescribed in the level of service handbook. It came from the State and staff is fine with that.

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to Policy 1.3.4 that talks about compatibility. After staff discussed this, it seemed it was designed to make sure that residential uses were not inefficiently using infrastructure. He suggested that rather than talk about compatibility we replace that with efficient use of existing and proposed ports/aviation because we are trying to make sure that those economic job center uses are located close to infrastructure rather than residential which would diminish our ability to use that transportation. He referred to Policy 3.3.2 and felt terminology is always important. Instead of “*overriding public interest*” it could be “*beneficial public interest*,” since it is an easier standard and one that people are more familiar with. As a general comment, he was very supportive of the direction these Comprehensive Plan Amendments are going and felt it was important to keep moving these forward. His suggestion is that we move forward and ask DEO to evaluate the potential conflicts between the Communities element, Concurrency element, and the Transportation element and give their opinion on it.

Mr. Joyce referred to Policy 1.1.3 d. on Page 1 and suggested changing it to say, “*a minimum of ten miles per year.*”

Mr. Ink referred to the end of Policy 1.1.4 g. that has the word “*and.*” He asked if that meant g. and h. go together.

Staff stated it was a grammatical error. The “and” should be located after “i.”

Mr. Andress opened this item for public comment: Public input was received from Ann Pierce. No other public input was received so the public input portion was closed.

Mr. Green made a motion that we recommend forwarding the Transportation element to the BOCC with the inclusion of changes recommended today, seconded by Mr. Church.

Mr. Hutchcraft stated he wanted to include a request for staff to ask DEO for clarification on those internal inconsistency issues.

The motioner and seconder agreed to the amendment.

The motion was called and passed 7-0.

B. CPA2011-00008 Future Land Use Element

Ms. Ebaugh gave an overview of this item and noted that the maps for both the Transportation and Land Use Element would be reviewed separately at a future meeting.

Mr. Hutchcraft asked why the floor area ratios for all land use categories were removed.

Ms. Ebaugh stated staff removed this because they did not feel it provided a good definition of the form for commercial space. She explained that you could have a floor area ratio of 1 and it could be the entire property or it could be 3 or 4 stories. It depends on how the land is used on the property. Therefore, staff believes that having no floor area ratio provides more flexibility rather than have an arbitrary standard that does not give direction to the form of commercial uses.

Mr. Hutchcraft thought the Department of Economic Opportunity might still want an intensity standard.

Ms. Ebaugh stated there was no intensity standard in the current Land Use Element. However, if the State looks for one, staff will address that as part of their comments to the ORC report.

Due to a question by Mr. Hutchcraft, Mr. O’Connor gave a status on the TDR study mentioned in Item 5 of the summary on the cover memo.

Mr. Hutchcraft stated that some of the TDR discussions go back to the DRGR, which is a 10-15 year old conversation. He felt this was an area that needed some attention as resources become available because there are properties that are going to get caught where there are restrictions without a mechanism in place to address those restrictions. He was in favor of anything the County could do to accelerate that.

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to Policy 2.1.11 on Page 21 of 44 where it states, “...*limited to locations and densities appropriate for residences.*” He asked if this language superseded what assisted living facilities were previously permitted to have. This language could mean that assisted living facilities would be given the same density as residential units, which conflicts with how things have always been done.

Mr. O’Connor stated this was not the intent and that staff could clarify this language.

Mr. Hutchcraft recommended it say something such as “...*appropriate for densities including conversion rates as defined in the LDC.*”

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to Policy 3.5.2, which talks about agriculturally related industrial uses being appropriate in the rural categories. He asked why “*coastal rural*” was not included in that list since there are packing facilities and processing facilities on Pine Island where the coastal rural is. He thought those types of uses would be appropriate and consistent.

Mr. O’Connor agreed it would be appropriate if it is related to agricultural activity and that staff could add it to that policy.

Mr. Church stated he was having difficulty reviewing the text portion of this element without at least a draft map to review along with the text. For instance, there is a new Suburban 10 category in the text, but there is no indication of where that category will be on a map. The same applies to all the mixed use areas mentioned throughout the document.

Mr. O’Connor stated that a motion on this particular element could be postponed until next month when the map will be available. He explained the Suburban 10 category to the LPA.

Mr. Church referred to Policy 1.4.4 on Page 11 where it says, “*The physical design of any airport expansion will minimize any degradation of the recharge capability of land being developed.*” He stated it would be hard for the Airport to meet that standard in an instance where they might want to put 100 acres of 4 foot thick concrete down for a new runway. He did not think the County should put an obstacle in front of the airport.

Mr. Josh Philpott from the Port Authority stated this was existing language in the current Lee Plan. He stated it was also a carryover of something that is in the Transportation Element. The Port Authority is not concerned with this language because they are required to go through the permitting agency requirements as well as water management requirements, so they do not see it as an issue.

Mr. Church referred to Policy 1.8.4 on Page 17 and felt it contradicted itself because it says, “*Standard density ranges from one dwelling unit per acre to six dwelling units per acre with a maximum of ten dwelling units per acre.*” But then it says “*In all cases on Gasparilla Island, the maximum density must not exceed 3 density units.*”

Mr. O’Connor stated this was new language and that he also could see conflicts in this language. This language was put together in order to address some concerns from property owners and residents in Gasparilla Island. He stated staff would work on it further.

Mr. Church referred to Policies 2.1.7 and 2.1.8 on Page 21 and stated it was redundant for them to be in this Element since they are addressed in other places. He also referred to Policy 2.2.3 on Page 22, which says, “*When a non-urban land use area within the county is approaching the capacity of the necessary facilities....*” He asked if this means it is okay for an urban area to approach capacity.

Mr. O’Connor stated that was correct because it is understood that urban areas have congestion. It does not mean it is alright if there is no available potable water or the capability to address waste water, but the Plan is contemplating that there will be delays and congestion in urban areas. However, it is not something the County wants to foster in non-urban areas.

Mr. Church referred to Item d. under Policy 3.6.7 on Page 35 and asked how staff could quantify projects as having a cumulative effect on county tax base. He also asked if this was an appropriate reason to deny a rezoning because of the impact it might have on the county budget.

Mr. O'Connor stated this was a list of criteria to analyze as part of the request to go back to an agricultural zoning district within an area that the County designated as urban and where they have primed with urban services. It may not be so much the county's tax base, but more of the county's investment in the area. In other words, should we go back to farming in an area where the County put in urban services that are needed?

Mr. Church still felt the language on that item should be clarified.

Mr. Andress stated there could be instances where farming was done in a particular area for generations. The County might have run infrastructure by this area. He still felt they should be able to continue farming there if they so choose. Mr. Andress stated he personally owned property that is zoned "industrial;" however, he was given permission from the County Commissioners to farm that land.

Mr. O'Connor stated that if a property owner is going through a planned development and currently have farming on the property, they will be allowed to continue that. However, they have to specifically request it in their list of uses. Therefore, someone could have an industrial planned development that allows agricultural uses to continue on it.

Mr. Green stated that perhaps "tax base" is not the proper wording, but he did understand staff's concern. If the County has put in significant infrastructure in the area and it will not be used nor do we get a tax benefit from that use, then this should be a consideration on whether to allow this or not. Should we revert back to it when the community is, in effect, losing money?

Mr. Hutchcraft suggested the verbiage be more along the lines of "*Consideration of public investment in the infrastructure.*"

Mr. Church referred to the last sentence of Policy 4.3.2 on Page 41 where it says, "*Development in accordance with these plans will be allowed through the local development order process.*" He asked if this meant there could be no rezoning for a mixed use project.

Ms. Ebaugh stated it means that in these areas the rezoning has already taken place. Staff is working with targeted mixed use centers in Lehigh, Tice community, College Parkway community, and North Fort Myers to develop regulating plans in accordance with Chapter 32. The County is adopting them as optional zoning overlays. In these areas, if a property owner comes in and develops in accordance with the adopted zoning overlay, they do not have to go through the zoning process because it has already been completed for them.

Mr. Church referred to Objective 4.4 on Page 41 and did not agree with having this level of detail in the Comprehensive Plan. From previous experience in Collier County, it does create an obstacle for projects. He recommended leaving this level of detail in the Land Development Code where it belongs.

After staff explained that this objective and policies are in the current Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Church stated it did not change his perspective on the subject.

Mr. Church referred to Policy 4.3.9 on Page 44 and asked if this meant that a mixed use project no longer needs to go through the public meeting process.

Ms. Ebaugh stated it means that staff recognizes mixed use projects, especially those we are currently working on through the community planning efforts, are being developed in concurrence with the community around it. Therefore, a specific project that comes forward does not have to go through the public meeting process with the community within the local area.

Mr. Church asked if a private developer could do that or if staff was only referring to ones that are part of community plans and have been identified.

Ms. Ebaugh stated that mixed use overlays that have already been adopted include some areas that a private developer could do. She pointed out that we still have the community planning requirement that exist within the community's ordinance. She agreed these are areas where a higher level of education of the public is necessary; however, it is already occurring.

Mr. Ink referred to Policy 1.3.5 Page 8 which allows limited commercial uses in a coastal environment. He suggested staff expand that to include big users such as marinas that might be outside a marina overlay district.

Mr. Ink referred to Objective 4.4 on Page 41 and concurred with Mr. Church's comment. He also felt this was too specific unless it is earmarked to already existing parcels of land.

Mr. O'Connor stated staff had put this criteria in here because it is part of the evolution of the Plan as the County has been moving towards encouraging more infill and redevelopment. The Mixed Use Overlay is one of the tools that were actually adopted into the Plan prior to the effort taking place now. The Mixed Use Overlay gives several incentives and the County wants to be assured that those incentives could not be abused by some projects.

Mr. Green referred to the removal of Policy 4.3.9 on Page 44 and asked if it had been vetted with the communities.

Ms. Ebaugh stated it had been vetted with the community and reiterated that if a community has that standard in their ordinance, then a project would still need to go through a community meeting process with community based on that community's element. That standard is not being deleted. In other words, this would only apply in an area where the community does not have specifications for hearings.

The LPA convened for a break at 10:03 a.m. and reconvened at 10:11 a.m.

Mr. Joyce referred to Policy 3.3.6 on Page 30 and stated it comes down to how much detail we want in the Comprehensive Plan. For instance, he felt there was too much detail with f.1., which outlines the type of shield luminary for lights along a coastal area. He noted the Land Development Code already has good language within it to address this so he did not feel this level of detail should be in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Joyce referred to Objective 3.6 on Page 34 and stated he would like to see more encouragement and incentives for agriculture including urban areas.

Mr. Mulicka referred to the last sentence under Policy 1.4.6 that says, "*Light industrial uses will only be permitted at the Alico Road and Luckett Road interchanges.*" He felt the individual property owner and the market might decide where that land use or that owner wants to use that property. He noted there were so many transportation needs and things on the freeway that many businesses want to be close to exists and the Airport. He did not feel the County should call out exits for someone's property rights.

After staff explained why this language was being proposed, Mr. Mulicka recommended there be some type of “*encouragement*” statement rather than a flat permitted or not permitted statement.

Mr. Mulicka referred to Policy 2.1.11 on Page 21 that deals with assisted living facilities. He noted that Shell Point Village would most likely not be able to pass this provision and that there might be a conflict on those typical layouts. He thought staff might need to work on this policy further.

Mr. Ink referred to Item b. under Policy 3.3.6 on Page 30 that says, “*Constructed to withstand winds of 200 mph in accordance with the Florida Building Code.*” He felt staff should look into this further because the 2010 Building Code looks at how wind is developed, what wind is, and how it is calculated, so Item b. might not be the best way to define that.

Mr. Andress opened this item for public comment. Public input was received from Ann Pierce. She provided the LPA with a handout (attached). No other public wished to comment so the public comment segment was closed.

Due to an initial question by Mr. Green, the LPA and staff discussed the Research Diamond area mentioned in Policy 1.9.11 on Page 20.

Mr. Andress noted staff was including a policy in the Comprehensive Plan for the Research Diamond area without having an actual plan in place. Since he felt it was a great idea and noted the County Commissioners are in favor of the idea, the next step would be to start working on the details with adequate policies to help us get to some type of plan to lead towards the type of development that we envision for this area in the future. He felt something needed to be done before more residential units are placed in that area. He also stated this specific area is our future growth potential for jobs and the employment that everyone is saying the community wants.

Mr. O’Connor stated he had seen a lot of lost opportunities around the University. He did not feel the residential development that has taken place around the University has actually helped the University. In fact, he felt there were instances when it hindered the University. Mr. O’Connor stated this was a concept that has not been completed. There have been vague recommendations made through some of the efforts made by the ULI and the American Institute of Architects. The Board of County Commissioners have not taken any formal action on this. The Commissioners are improving infrastructure in the area such as the Alico Road widening project and some road extensions over to Sunshine Boulevard in Lehigh Acres. The County has obtained part of that right of way and are negotiating to obtain the other parts of the right of way. Since it is a concept that has been well received by the Board, staff felt obligated to put in a policy that was specific to that effort since the Comprehensive Plan is in the process of being updated. He stated that such a policy could assist in obtaining grants in the area. Mr. O’Connor agreed that the concept has merit but needs to be worked on further.

Mr. Green referred to comments made by Ms. Pierce that 40 square miles is too much. Since we do not have a map, staff could be less definitive on where it is and eliminate the 40 square miles from the language. Since this item might get continued until the LPA can view the map, he suggested staff evaluate Ms. Pierce’s language recommendations in the Economic Element as well as changes to this element as counter points to think about. Perhaps staff might bring forth something new on this item for the LPA to review.

Mr. Church referred to Policy 2.1.8, which specifically discourages any land plan amendments at the intersection of SR82, which is being widened and Daniels Road. He felt this property has great potential for the County and could tie into this Research Diamond proposal. However, this policy discourages plan amendments in this area even though this is one area of the DRGR that has the potential to be another great part of the County.

Mr. Address stated that if the County is spending millions of dollars to tie Alico north into Sunshine Boulevard at SR82, it is going to be a major corridor that is going to have a lot of future growth in it.

Mr. Hutchcraft stated there is significant infrastructure in that area that could contribute to economic development. To that end, policies are usually supposed to be measurable and specific. Two studies have been completed. At a minimum, Policy 1.9.11 should be expanded to reference some of the recommendations that came out of those two studies. Those recommendations should be listed and identified. There might also be other properties in the area that could be included so it is important that this area be identified.

Mr. Address stated he was in favor of this item being continued to give staff more time. Before a motion was made, he referred to Objective 4.4 on Page 41 and agreed with other LPA comments that it was too much detail for the Comprehensive Plan. He stated staff should look at having it in the Land Development Code and removing it from the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hutchcraft made a motion to continue CPA2011-00008 to the April 28, 2014 Local Planning Agency meeting so that it could be reviewed again along with its companion document which is the Future Land Use Map and give staff direction to consider comments and recommendations made today, seconded by Mr. Green. The motion was called and passed 7-0.

Agenda Item 7 – Other Business

River Hall

Due to a question by Mr. Address, staff gave an update on the River Hall project, which is scheduled to be presented to the Local Planning Agency on May 19, 2014.

Mr. Address noted the LPA asked the Attorney's office to come up with a definition for "*overriding public necessity*." He believed the answer from the Attorney's office was that they would use what is listed in the Webster's dictionary.

Mr. Jacob stated that was correct. The fact that a definition is not provided does not mean there is no defined term in a standard dictionary such as Webster's.

Mr. Joyce stated that since there were so many new Local Planning Agency members, he felt they should receive a briefing on previous River Hall discussions.

Mr. O'Connor stated that would be included as part of the staff report.

Draft TDR Study

Due to a question by Mr. Church on where he could find the draft TDR Study, staff directed him to where the link would be located on the DCD website, which is:

<http://www.leegov.com/gov/dept/dcd/Planning/Pages/TDR.aspx>

Agenda Item 8 – Adjournment

The next Local Planning Agency meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 28, 2014, at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Chambers, Old Lee County Courthouse, 2120 Main Street, Fort Myers, FL 33901.

The meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.

Land Use Element

POLICY 1.9.11: Suggested alternative

Start 7th line down on proposed section

County resources such as Southwest Florida International Airport (SWFIA), Jet Blue Park and Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU), anchor a potentially prime location for creating synergies among research, renewable energy, enterprise opportunities and economic growth.

Diverse, mixed-use, multi-modal development, (including infill ?) with planned infrastructure, transportation and services, to create more walkable, transit-oriented communities that meet complete streets objectives will be encouraged.

Suggested alternative additional placement in

Economic Element

CPA2011-05

GOAL 1: Lee County will achieve and maintain a diversified and stable economy by providing a positive business climate that assures promotes maximum employment opportunities, an array of business opportunities, and supports the county's economic priorities while maintaining to maintain a high quality of life.

OBJECTIVE 1.1: Formulate an economic development strategy and create complementary programs designed to foster the retention, expansion, and attraction of target employers that enhance the business climate for attracting emerging markets, diversify Lee County's economic base, expand existing businesses and established industries, and create jobs.

Policy 1.1. X: Focus on the development and intensification of a variety of enterprise and research and development (R & D) activities that may synergistically benefit from either geographic or electronic clustering, rendering physical or virtual logistic proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU), the Southwest Florida International Airport (SWFIA) or other current and future assets. Seek to maximize return on investments through efficiencies in coordinated design, planning and use of all infrastructure and public services.