

Mr. Hutchcraft applauded their effort to receive input from the community. He asked to what extent the final scenario would be driving by the public input results.

Mr. Spikowski stated the public scoring is more for the information of the MPO committees and boards. The technical team will be working more on a technical basis including the specific evaluations.

Mr. Hutchcraft referred to the EAR process the LPA has been going through. He asked if the EAR amendments would reconcile with where the traffic study is going.

Mr. Spikowski stated they were in sync because the planners are working on the County's plan update and his group is involved with preparing the scenario so there is no reason for them to go off in different directions.

Mr. Church asked how this would become law and how it would affect future projects that come in and have to be evaluated against that model.

Mr. Spikowski stated it does not become law or get adopted as a future land use map would. Once the MPO selects a scenario or some combination of scenarios, it will be used in their planning for the road system. To the extent that this is embedded in the model, it may have some effect on people doing future traffic reviews.

Mr. Address stated the MPO is working on a study for transportation impact fees. He asked how that would play into this study.

Mr. Spikowski stated the MPO is doing some work on that subject as part of the Long Range Transportation Plan; however, what Mr. Spikowski presented today is the first step of the Long Range Transportation Plan. If they have started on the transportation impact fees study, he was not aware of it.

Because this was only an information item for the LPA where a vote was not required, this item was not opened for public comment.

## **Agenda Item 5 – Lee Plan Amendments**

### **A. CPA2013-00008 Estero Apartments**

Mr. Blackwell reviewed the staff report with the LPA and noted that staff recommends that the BOCC adopt the proposed amendment. It is going for adoption because it is a small scale amendment, which means there is no transmittal phase.

Jim Ink asked staff to elaborate more on how they feel this proposal is consistent with the residential on this specific parcel within the CPD of the interchange area.

Mr. Blackwell noted the Lee Plan is trying to create more diverse housing types specifically in the Estero area where it is predominantly single family residential. This proposal would help introduce apartment complexes, which are multifamily units. Another reason for staff's efforts to create mixed use is that it reduces the effect of sprawl and the effect of increased population on services. By locating a project at this location, the residents would be closer to commercial uses. Even if they are driving as opposed to walking, they will be driving less. In addition, this site has back road connections to some of these locations such as the Medical Center to the west as opposed to getting onto Corkscrew Road.

Mr. Ink asked for clarification that staff is comfortable with a residential site being directly adjacent to I75 and if they consider it good planning.

Mr. Blackwell stated there was some concern about traffic noise, but he noted that good site design can achieve that. He stated the applicant is motivated to do that in order to get people to live at this apartment complex. Therefore; the issue of living next to I75 is not as strong an issue as some might think it is.

Mr. Andress asked about the median cuts in the area and whether they provide adequate access for the density that this project entails.

Mr. Blackwell stated that according to DOT staff this generates less traffic demand than the currently permitted commercial uses.

Mr. Church asked if input was received from the Estero Community Planning Panel.

Mr. Blackwell stated the applicant met with the Estero community twice and incorporated some of their requests such as pedestrian connections.

Mr. Hutchcraft noted that the frontage road for this project is already well developed. From looking at the aerial, it appears there are 3 or 4 connections down to Corkscrew Road and then one to Three Oaks Parkway. Therefore, he felt the traffic is distributed well already.

Since there were no further comments by the LPA, Mr. Andress opened this item for public comment.

Public comment was received from: Jack Lienesch, representing the Estero Community Planning Panel, Leo "Larry" Laurence Williams (sole managing member of my company Jenlar Properties LLC who owns Tire Choice and the Total Car Care building and property near the intersection of I75 and Corkscrew Road in the Estero Interstate Commerce Park), Steve Hartsell representing the applicants for Estero Apartmetns, and Dr. Lacagnina from Lee Memorial Health Systems.

Mr. Green referred to comments made by Mr. Larry Williams that he had concerns with Estero Apartments blocking the visibility of his property from I75. He noted that this property is currently vacant and that any development located there would block some of the visibility to his property.

Mr. Williams stated that although this is true he believed that some type of single story development would have less impact on his visibility than multiple story apartment buildings.

Mr. Church referred to a comment by Mr. Hartsell that this project would be a two story complex. He asked if there is a zoning height limitation.

Mr. Hartsell believed the zoning height limitation was 45 feet. He noted they were not asking for an increase in height for this location.

Due to comments made by Dr. Lacagnina from Lee Memorial Health Systems regarding the impact planning has on the health of the community, Mr. Andress noted the applicants addressed the issue of connectivity by having bike paths and walking trails to help the residents access other businesses along the way. This also helps aide in residents having a healthier lifestyle. He noted the County has been trying to incorporate that into each proposal that gets approved. He thanked Dr. Lacagnina for the work the hospital is doing and for the work he has done on the Horizon Council.

Mr. Green asked staff to comment on any negative impacts they think this project might create on the adjacent property mentioned by Mr. Williams.

Mr. Blackwell stated he did not see any negative impacts apart from traffic going past their site from Estero Apartments to Corkscrew Road. However, there will only be 136 units which is less than what would have been allowed under the current zoning.

Mr. Hutchcraft asked if there was assurance that the adjacent parcels will still be able to fully utilize their properties now that there is a residential use adjacent to them. In other words, will there be restrictions to their hours of operation or restrictions in noise because of this residential site?

Mr. Blackwell stated there would be no adverse impact on the adjacent parcels. The conditions of their CPD will remain unchanged.

Mr. Joyce noted we were putting a lot of units on this 8.7 acre site. The Estero Community Plan has some emphasis on water quality where it states, "*All new developments adjacent to the Estero River, must incorporate design techniques to improve water quality.*" He recommended that this site also include some review of stormwater and surface water treatment in order to meet those requirements of the Estero Community Plan. He gave an example of how this was handled with the Estero Bay Chevrolet site.

Mr. Address stated those types of activities are typically addressed during the zoning process as opposed to the Comprehensive Plan.

**Mr. Green made a motion to recommend the Board of County Commissioners adopt CPA2013-00008 Estero Apartments with thought and consideration given to smart water management, seconded by Mr. Hutchcraft.**

Mr. Ink stated that initially he thought this project was a good idea until he reviewed the map and saw that we were introducing residential in a completely constrained commercial planned development of high intensity. To him, this was not good compatibility. He would not oppose it if it were located on the north or west side where it is more transitional to the surrounding community, but he did not feel the proposed location was appropriate for this type of development. As such, he could not support the motion.

Mr. Mulicka stated he would support the motion. He noted that the height of this development was no higher than what a warehouse building could be next door or an industrial compound. As a business owner, he felt it would be advantageous to have several hundred new customers drive by his facility to buy tires, etc. The new residents will be looking for places that offer those services near their home as well as shopping malls, etc. He also felt it was favorable to work with a thoughtful developer who was ready to build now rather than having a speculative zoning change in the hopes of being able to market it.

**The motion was called and passed 6-1. Mr. Ink was opposed.**

#### **B. CPA2014-00003 Estero Plan**

This item was removed from the agenda and will be scheduled at a future meeting.