

**CPA 2008-05
REVISE POLICY 6.1.2.9
COMMERCIAL LOCATION STANDARDS
BOCC SPONSORED
AMENDMENT
TO THE**

LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

THE LEE PLAN

BoCC Adoption Document

*Lee County Planning Division
1500 Monroe Street
P.O. Box 398
Fort Myers, FL 33902-0398
(239) 533-8585*

March 3, 2010

**LEE COUNTY
DIVISION OF PLANNING
STAFF REPORT FOR
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT
CPA 2008-05**

Text Amendment

Map Amendment

This Document Contains the Following Reviews:	
✓	Staff Review
✓	Local Planning Agency Review and Recommendation
✓	Board of County Commissioners Hearing for Transmittal
✓	Staff Response to the DCA Objections, Recommendations, and Comments (ORC) Report
✓	Board of County Commissioners Hearing for Adoption

STAFF REPORT PREPARATION DATE: November 7, 2008

PART I - BACKGROUND AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION

A. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

1. APPLICANT / REPRESENTATIVE:

Lee County Board of County Commissioners/Division of Planning

2. REQUEST:

Revise Policy 6.1.2.9, to add a cross reference exempting the Commercial Future Land Use category from Commercial Site Location Standards when appropriate site development regulations are incorporated into the planned development.

B. STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY

1. RECOMMENDATION: Planning staff recommends that the BoCC transmit the revision to Policy 6.1.2.9.

2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:

- The County adopted the Commercial Future Land Use Map (FLUM) category in 2007 (CPA 2005-39 and Ordinance No. 07-09).
- The Future Land Use description of the Commercial category exempts development in the Commercial category from complying with the site location

criteria provided in Goal 6 when appropriate site development regulations are incorporated into the planned development.

- Policy 6.1.2.9 states: “The location standards in this policy are not applicable in the Interchange land use category, or in Lehigh Acres where commercial uses are permitted in accordance with Policies 1.8.1 through 1.8.3, or within the Captiva community in the areas identified by Policy 13.2.1”.
- A reference to the Commercial FLUM category was not added to Policy 6.1.2.9 when the Commercial Future Land Use Category was adopted.
- There exists a conflict between the Future Land Use description of the Commercial FLUM category and Policy 6.1.2.9.
- Revising Policy 6.1.2.9 to include a reference to the Commercial FLUM category exempting the category from site location standards will provide consistency between the policy and the Future Land Use description.

C. RECOMMENDED LEE PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT

POLICY 6.1.2:

9. The location standards in this policy are not applicable in the Interchange land use category, or in Lehigh Acres where commercial uses are permitted in accordance with Policies 1.8.1 through 1.8.3, or within the Captiva community in the areas identified by Policy 13.2.1, or within the Commercial Future Land Use category when appropriate site development regulations are incorporated into the planned development.

D. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Board of County Commissioners adopted a new Commercial Future Land Use Map category in 2007 by Ordinance 07-09. The Commercial FLUM category is exempt from site location standards when appropriate site development regulations are incorporated into the planned development. Staff did not add the Commercial FLUM category to Policy 6.1.2.9 when the Commercial FLUM category was adopted, creating a conflict between the Future Land Use description of the Commercial FLUM category and the Policy.

PART II - STAFF ANALYSIS

A. STAFF DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION

To create consistency between the Future Land Use description of the Commercial FLUM category and Policy 6.1.2.9, Staff recommends revising the Policy.

B. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board of County Commissioners transmit the following revision to Policy 6.1.2.9:

POLICY 6.1.2:

9. The location standards in this policy are not applicable in the Interchange land use category, or in Lehigh Acres where commercial uses are permitted in accordance with Policies 1.8.1 through 1.8.3, ~~or~~ within the Captiva community in the areas identified by Policy 13.2.1, or within the Commercial Future Land Use category when appropriate site development regulations are incorporated into the planned development.

**PART III - LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION**

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: November 24, 2008

A. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW

Staff explained that the proposed amendment clarifies in Policy 6.1.2 that commercial site location standards are not applicable in the Commercial Future Land Use Category when appropriate site development regulations are incorporated into the planned development. Staff noted that the commercial future land use category is generally exempt from site location standards because those were considered when the category itself – and its typical land uses – were deemed suitable and adopted for that location. However, this clarification of language in Goal 6 will resolve questions that have come up, for example, in coastal high hazard zones.

One LPA member asked if this relates to mixed-use developments. Staff responded that it does not.

Another asked if this would intensify commercial use in the coastal construction zone. Staff responded that while it might, it would also discourage residential development in the coastal construction zone. Staff provided an example.

No one from the public commented on this item.

B. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** The LPA recommends that this proposed amendment be transmitted.
2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The LPA accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff.

C. VOTE:

NOEL ANDRESS	AYE
LES COCHRAN	AYE
RONALD INGE	AYE
CARLETON RYFFEL	AYE
LELAND M. TAYLOR	AYE
RAE ANN WESSEL	AYE
VACANT	

**PART IV - BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
HEARING FOR TRANSMITTAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

DATE OF TRANSMITTAL HEARING: September 23, 2009

A. BOARD REVIEW: The proposed amendment was heard as part of the consent agenda. The Board of Commissioners provided no comment on the amendment. No member of the public appeared or addressed the amendment.

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. **BOARD ACTION:** The Board voted to transmit the proposed amendment as part of the consent agenda.
2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The Board accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff and the Local Planning Agency.

C. VOTE:

BRIAN BIGELOW	<hr/> AYE <hr/>
TAMMARA HALL	<hr/> AYE <hr/>
ROBERT P. JANES	<hr/> ABSENT <hr/>
RAY JUDAH	<hr/> AYE <hr/>
FRANK MANN	<hr/> AYE <hr/>

**PART V - DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS OBJECTIONS,
RECOMMENDATIONS, AND COMMENTS (ORC) REPORT**

DATE OF ORC REPORT: January 15, 2010

A. DCA OBJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

The Florida Department of Community Affairs provided no objections, recommendations, or comments concerning the proposed amendment.

B. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the proposed amendment as transmitted.

**PART VI - BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
HEARING FOR ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

DATE OF ADOPTION HEARING: March 3, 2010

A. BOARD REVIEW: The proposed amendment was heard as part of the consent agenda. The Board of Commissioners provided no comment on the amendment. No member of the public commented on the proposed amendment.

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. **BOARD ACTION:** The Board voted to adopt the proposed amendment as part of the consent agenda.
2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The Board accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff and the Local Planning Agency.

C. VOTE:

BRIAN BIGELOW	<hr/> AYE <hr/>
TAMMARA HALL	<hr/> AYE <hr/>
ROBERT P. JANES	<hr/> AYE <hr/>
RAY JUDAH	<hr/> AYE <hr/>
FRANK MANN	<hr/> AYE <hr/>