

kwiktag®

022 562 315



**CPA2000-19
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
(941) 479-8585*

January 10, 2002

**LEE COUNTY
DIVISION OF PLANNING
STAFF REPORT FOR
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT
CPA2000-00019**

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: June 18, 2001

PART I - BACKGROUND AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION

A. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

1. SPONSOR/APPLICANT:

A. SPONSOR:

LEE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REPRESENTED BY LEE COUNTY DIVISION OF PLANNING

B. APPLICANT

THE ESTERO COMMUNITY
REPRESENTED BY DAN DELISI
VANASSE AND DAYLOR, LLP

2. REQUEST:

Amend the Lee Plan, text and Future Land Use Map series, to incorporate the recommendations of the Estero Community Planning Effort, establishing a Goal and subsequent Objectives and Policies specific to the Estero Community.

B. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The proposed plan amendment was formally initiated by the Board of County Commissioners on September 19, 2000. Staff recommended that the amendment be initiated by the County as a response to

the concerns of Estero residents about planning and zoning issues arising from recent zoning approvals in the area. This amendment is, however, a grass roots effort originating from the Estero Community, that has been coordinated by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, and the development community. Despite the fact that this was a publicly-initiated amendment, staff has reviewed it as it would a privately-initiated amendment. The Estero Community submitted a set of proposed amendments to the Lee Plan with backup documentation, and staff reviewed and responded to it. The Preliminary Draft of The Estero Community Plan has been included as Attachment 1 of this report. Staff has worked closely with the Estero Community throughout the process in providing comments and recommendations, where appropriate.

Staff believes that the Estero Community planning process originated as a result of a general interest in recent zoning and land use planning issues in the Estero area. Many Estero residents felt that they did not have enough control over the manner in which their community was growing, and believed that the County should do more in its planning efforts to address issues that were specific to the Estero community. The community recognized that Estero was a rapidly growing area within Lee County, and questioned whether existing zoning regulations and growth management policies truly reflected the unique needs of the community. The community decided that some form of action should be taken to ensure that Estero developed in a manner that was consistent with the community vision for the future. The options that were considered ranged from incorporation, to annexing into Bonita Springs, to developing a community plan that would be incorporated into the Lee County Comprehensive Plan. The community took notice of the fact that the idea of creating "sector plans" was gaining popularity in many of the unincorporated places in Lee County, and decided that this was the preferred route to address their concerns. The community, with the assistance of a planning consultant, prepared their own "sector plan" and submitted it to the County with the idea that their recommendations would ultimately be adopted into the Lee Plan. This proposed plan amendment represents the final product of this sector planning process that has developed over the past year.

The community concerns were summarized and categorized into six areas by the planning consultant as follows:

1. **Community Character** - The Community has expressed a desire to implement a stronger community planning approach to proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage, and the location and type of certain land uses.
2. **Residential Land Uses** - The Community identified a desire to maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment of potentially incompatible uses.
3. **Commercial Land Uses** - The community has a strong desire to limit "tourist oriented uses", certain "detrimental uses", and high intensity uses along specific corridors. At the same time, the community expressed a desire for small-scale neighborhood commercial development that services existing neighborhoods.

4. **Natural Resources** - The community expressed a strong desire for extra protection of groundwater resources, wetlands, and other aquatic habitat through acquisition, incentives, and increased regulations.
5. **Public Participation** - The community has requested the opportunity to become more actively and meaningfully involved in the development approval process.
6. **Community Resources** - The community has expressed a desire for the expansion of certain community resources, including a community center, meeting area, and governmental service offices - such as a post office.

The planning consultant drafted a set of goals, objectives, and policies in response to the concerns of the Estero Community. The intent was that these goals, objectives, and policies would eventually be incorporated into the Lee Plan.

Through the course of this plan amendment cycle, planning staff has worked with the Estero Community to resolve the differences that existed between staff and the community at the beginning of the planning process. Staff believes that the final policy language represents an agreeable compromise that will serve the needs of the residents of Estero in guiding growth and development in a manner that is consistent with the community vision.

C. STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ADOPTION

Staff recommends that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the proposed amendment, including the text additions shown below and the changes to Map 16, the Planning Communities Map, to include the new Estero Planning Community boundaries as shown in Attachment 4 of this report.

RECOMMENDED TEXT ADDITIONS TO THE LEE PLAN

PROPOSED NEW VISION STATEMENT:

21. Estero - "To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and a unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

MODIFICATIONS TO CURRENT LEE PLAN PROVISIONS:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

PROPOSED NEW GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:

Changes proposed since the transmittal hearing are shown in strike-out and underline format.

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Planning Community as depicted on Map 16.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County to adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations or policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering, shading of parking areas, signage and lighting consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: The Estero Community will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Policy 19.1.6: By 2002, the Estero Community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting, sidewalks, and insuring safe

and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2004 Lee County will evaluate historic resources, and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future County regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture, lighting and signage, and provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Planning Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses must be in compliance with the Commercial Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8). ~~Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential.~~

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of office and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.5: The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code); ~~free-standing~~ nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges not associated with a Group III Restaurant; and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre.

Policy 19.2.6: Lee County encourages commercial developments within the Estero Planning Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Planning Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable

housing, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew Road by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide an additional buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat, provided whenever possible, within one mile of the Estero Fire District Boundary. ~~within the Estero Planning Community Boundaries.~~
- Lee County will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resources within the Estero Planning Community.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions, and zoning approvals.

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: The Estero Community will establish a "document clearing house" in Estero, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations and resolutions will be provided for public inspection. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community must conduct one public informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted before the application can be found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Estero Scrub Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a "gateway" at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

D. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT

- The proposed amendments to the Lee Plan are based on a collaborative effort between interested citizens of Estero, the Estero Chamber of Commerce, the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, the development community, and Lee County Planning Staff.
- The Estero planning effort originated as a grass-roots effort by citizens of Estero who took an active interest in the County's current policies regarding land use issues in Estero.
- Currently, the Lee Plan contains few regulations that are specific to the Estero Community.
- The Board of County Commissioners has provided financial and political support to community planning efforts in Lee County.
- The Estero Community Plan actively solicited direction from citizens of Estero through two public visioning workshops held on August 15, 2000 and September 19, 2000, as well as through a community-wide informational survey. There was also a great deal of individual communication between Estero residents and their planning consultant. The proposed Lee Plan changes reflect the direction provided by Estero citizens through these visioning processes.
- The Community has expressed a desire to implement a stronger community approach to land use and zoning issues to proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage, and the location of certain land uses.
- The Community identified a desire to maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment.
- The community has a desire to limit "tourist oriented uses", certain "detrimental uses", and high intensity uses along specific corridors. At the same time, the community expressed a desire for small-scale neighborhood commercial development.
- The community expressed a desire for extra protection of groundwater resources, wetlands, and species habitat through acquisition, incentives, and increased regulations.

- The Estero Community has publicly expressed dissatisfaction with the current public notification procedures for zoning actions, plan amendments, and Land Development Code amendments. The community wants additional opportunities to become more involved in the land use planning and zoning process.
- The Estero Community wants to see an expansion of community resources in the area including a community center, meeting area, and government offices.
- Several of the goals, objectives, and policies proposed by the Estero Community call for an increase in the County's core level of service, but have not provided any analysis of the additional costs associated with providing these additional resources. In the absence of such analysis, staff has recommended that such goals, objectives, or policies be modified or deleted to remove the additional resource burden from the County.
- Several of the goals, objectives, and policies proposed by the Estero Community call for the County to regulate lands which are under State control. In such cases, staff has recommended that such goals, objectives, and policies be modified or deleted to clarify that the County does not control these lands.
- The processes of rezoning, Lee Plan amendment, or Land Development Code amendment require one or more public hearings, which require the County to provide public notice by law. The County provides this public notice as part of its core level of service. Any type of additional notification or community outreach activities, such as those desired by the Estero Community, would require the County to commit to raising its current levels of service.

PART II - LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: June 25, 2001

A. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW

Planning staff provided a summary of the proposed amendment, stating that the Estero Community Plan was a cooperative effort between County staff, the Board of County Commissioners, and the Estero Planning Committee. A representative of the Estero planning group also provided an introduction to the proposed amendment.

One member of the LPA made the comment that the term "Estero Community" was being used throughout the report to refer to the geographical area of Estero as well as the community group that was organizing the planning effort. It was suggested that the term "Estero Boundary," or something similar be used to describe the geographical area of Estero. Staff agreed that the language should be modified to clearly distinguish between the community group and the geographical area of Estero.

One member of the public from the Estero area spoke in favor the proposed amendment, and specifically the proposed policies relating to increased public participation in the zoning process (Objective 19.5). This individual stated that the current system of notification was not effective, and did not give interested parties enough time to organize any response to proposed zoning actions.

Staff outlined its concerns with the public participation objective and policies. Staff understood the concerns of the community, and agreed on the importance of having public involvement in the zoning process. Staff was uncomfortable, however, with putting the County in a position where it would have to facilitate and supervise the Estero Community's involvement in the zoning process. Staff asserted that it should not be the responsibility of the County to tell the Estero Community when it should be concerned about an issue. Staff asserted that it should be the community's responsibility to initiate its involvement in zoning issues, and that the role of the County should be to respond to the community when they do have concerns.

Staff also stated that the Land Development Code was recently amended to provide a courtesy notice of zoning actions for surrounding property owners. Additionally, in the near future, these notices will be posted on the County's web site. Staff has been attempting to increase public notification throughout the County, but believes it would be problematic to increase the level of notification in one area, but not in the rest of the County.

The LPA shared staff's concerns about the public participation section and the potential complications that could arise with placing these proposed policies in the Lee Plan.

The representative of the Estero Community agreed with staff's concerns about increasing public notice in one area, but not in the rest of the County. The community representative still thought that the public participation language should remain as the community proposed it. This individual hoped that the Board of County Commissioners would take a comprehensive look at public participation throughout the County.

A member of the public spoke in favor of the proposed amendment. This individual thought that the County should extend its core services to increase public participation, otherwise, Estero would incorporate or annex into Bonita. This individual also spoke in favor of the proposed policies 19.2.5 and 19.4.2.

The LPA expressed some concern over the proposed Policy 19.2.5, and specifically the part about prohibiting uses that have outdoor display in excess of one acre. The LPA thought that this policy would cause problems for existing developments that have such outdoor display, as well as for properties that are zoned for uses that would allow such outdoor display. The LPA questioned whether such properties would be "vested" for the use in question, and whether existing uses of this type would be prohibited from expanding their outdoor storage areas if they exceeded one acre. The LPA asked staff how many existing businesses in Estero had outdoor display in excess of one acre. Staff did not have specific data to respond to this, but did state that they could not think of any off hand.

There was a brief discussion about using the term "lounge" in Policy 19.2.5. This is not a recognized term in the Land Development Code. The terminology in the proposed policy should correspond to the terminology in the Land Development Code.

A member of the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization spoke about proposed Policy 19.6.6, which pertains to monitoring mining truck traffic on Corkscrew Road. Although staff recommended the deletion of this policy, this individual thought the policy was important to promote public safety and preserve community character. A member of Lee County DOT staff responded to these comments. DOT staff recommended the deletion of this policy for a variety of reasons. DOT stated that they already monitor the truck traffic situation on Corkscrew Road, at the direction of the Board of County Commissioners. DOT was uncomfortable with the fact that the policy did not provide any indication of how long the truck traffic monitoring would take place, and that the policy did not account for the possibility that the issue would ever be resolved. Also, DOT staff pointed out that Corkscrew Road is an arterial road which is designed to carry large volumes of traffic, including mining trucks.

Another member of the public spoke extensively about the proposed amendment. He questioned how the proposed Vision Statement language about creating a "village" quality in Estero would impact the proposed regional mall at U.S. 41 and Coconut Road. He also stated that Policy 19.2.2 refers to "retail site location standards," when these standards are commonly referred to as "commercial site location standards." He also questioned whether the special case language modification shown in Policy 6.1.2.1(e) was repeating the other special case language in the proposed Policy 19.2.2. He recommended combining the two proposed policies, if possible. With regard to Policy 19.4.1, which provides for a 50-foot buffer along the Estero River for new development, it was recommended that this policy be placed in the Land Development Code, as it would be the more appropriate place for such specific standards. With regard to Policy 19.5.3, which would require a rezoning applicant to conduct a public workshop, this individual stated that there were too many uncertainties surrounding the policy. He questioned what the public advertising requirements would be for the workshop; where the workshop would be held; who would be responsible for securing a meeting space; who would be responsible for moderating the workshop; and would there be a time limit on the workshop.

The LPA, staff, and the applicant had a general discussion of the issues and concerns raised by the public. The LPA had concerns about the public participation policies and how they would be implemented.

Certain members of the LPA recommended that the policies related to public participation should be applied on a county-wide basis, and not just in the Estero Community.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the LPA thought that there were too many uncertainties relating to Policy 19.2.5, Objective 19.5, Policy 19.5.1, Policy 19.5.2, and Policy 19.5.3. The LPA thought that additional analysis should be conducted on these objectives policies, and requested that staff bring these items back at the subsequent LPA hearing. The LPA did recommend, however, that the Board of County Commissioners transmit the balance of the proposed amendment, with several modifications to staff's proposed language. The specific language changes are shown in Item H. below.

B. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** The LPA recommended that the Board of County Commissioners transmit the proposed amendment with the language changes shown in Item H. below. The recommendation at this hearing did not include transmittal of the proposed Policy 19.2.5, Objective 19.5, Policy 19.5.1, Policy 19.5.2, and Policy 19.5.3. These items were addressed in a separate recommendation at the subsequent LPA hearing.
2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The LPA accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff.

C. VOTE:

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| NOEL ANDRESS | AYE |
| SUSAN BROOKMAN | AYE |
| BARRY ERNST | AYE |
| RONALD INGE | AYE |
| GORDON REIGELMAN | AYE |
| VIRGINIA SPLITT | ABSENT |
| GREG STUART | ABSTAIN |

D. ADDITIONAL LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: July 23, 2001

Subsequent to the June 25th public hearing, staff re-evaluated the policies that the LPA was uncomfortable with, and issued a memo addressing the outstanding issues. A copy of this memo has been included as Attachment 6 of this report. Staff provided a brief summary of the outstanding issues to the LPA, and the LPA provided general discussion.

The LPA was satisfied with the additional analysis and revised staff recommendation on the proposed Policy 19.2.5, which pertains to prohibiting detrimental uses and retail uses with outdoor display.

The LPA still had some concern over the public participation policies (Objective 19.5 and subsequent policies). The LPA questioned whether there would be any procedural requirements for the public workshop required by the proposed Policy 19.5.3. Staff responded that the language in the Lee Plan was general in nature, and that more specific details would be placed in the Land Development Code in the near future to address the specific details of the public workshop. Staff anticipates that new language will be added to the Land Development Code that will address issues such as the level of involvement from the applicant and staff, advertising requirements, and the possible effect of this meeting on zoning applications. It was staff's belief that such details were not appropriate for the Lee Plan.

The LPA questioned what organizations would be empowered to conduct these public workshops. Staff responded that there were no particular organizations that would conduct these meetings. It would be the responsibility of the applicant in each zoning case to conduct this meeting.

A member of the public stated that Policy 19.5.3, as proposed, states that if the public workshop is not conducted within 30 days of submitting the rezoning application, then the rezoning will be found inconsistent with the Lee Plan. This individual questioned if this was staff's intent, and suggested that the 30 day provision might be too stringent of a requirement. In response, staff suggested that the language be changed so that the public workshop must be conducted prior to the application being found sufficient.

A member of the LPA questioned whether staff was concerned about establishing different rules for individual communities, in light of the fact that there are several communities that are currently in the process of developing community plans. Staff responded that the prospect of implementing several sets of regulations has been a concern from the beginning.

The LPA suggested that the proposed policies relating to increased public participation should be applied county-wide, and not just in Estero. This concept had the full support of all LPA members. Staff stated that applying the public participation policies county-wide would probably be beyond the scope of the current plan amendment, but that the LPA could still recommend, through a separate motion, for the Board of County Commissioners to instruct staff to work on applying the new regulations county-wide.

Two members of the public spoke generally in favor of making the public participation policies applicable county-wide.

One member of the LPA stated that it was imperative that the procedural issues relating to the public participation policies be dealt with through Land Development Code amendments, in addition to the proposed Lee Plan amendments. The LPA questioned how they could be assured that appropriate language would be added to the LDC to augment the regulations being proposed through this Plan amendment. Staff responded that if the Board of County Commissioners votes to transmit this amendment, then staff would begin working on the LDC language. Staff also recommended that the LPA recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that they direct staff to initiate the LDC amendments.

One member of the LPA brought up the idea of using email as a means of providing information to Estero residents, and suggested the possibility of adding language to one of the policies that would encourage staff to use email. Staff responded that, with the technology available today, it was a given that email would be used as one method of dispersing the required information to citizens. Staff could provide the

documents and notices through several methods. Staff recommended not adding language about email to the Estero Plan language.

E. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** The LPA recommended that the Board of County Commissioners transmit Policy 19.2.5, Objective 19.5, Policy 19.5.1, Policy 19.5.2, and Policy 19.5.3. Language changes to Policy 19.5.3 were recommended by the LPA as shown in Part H. below. The LPA also made a separate recommendation that the Board of County Commissioners direct staff to refine the procedural requirements embedded in Policy 19.5.1, Policy 19.5.2, and Policy 19.5.3, and amend the Land Development Code to make these procedural requirements applicable on a county-wide basis.

2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The LPA accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff.

F. VOTE (on first motion to transmit the applicable objectives and policies)

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| NOEL ANDRESS | AYE _____ |
| SUSAN BROOKMAN | AYE _____ |
| BARRY ERNST | AYE _____ |
| RONALD INGE | ABSENT _____ |
| GORDON REIGELMAN | ABSENT _____ |
| VIRGINIA SPLITT | ABSENT _____ |
| GREG STUART | ABSTAIN _____ |

G. VOTE (on second motion to amend the LDC to apply public participation policies county-wide)

| | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| NOEL ANDRESS | AYE _____ |
| SUSAN BROOKMAN | AYE _____ |
| BARRY ERNST | AYE _____ |
| RONALD INGE | ABSENT _____ |
| GORDON REIGELMAN | ABSENT _____ |
| VIRGINIA SPLITT | ABSENT _____ |
| GREG STUART | AYE _____ |

H. LANGUAGE TRANSMITTED BY THE LPA:

Note: Changes made to the original language through the LPA hearing process are shown in strike-thru and double-underline format.

Vision Statement:

21. Estero - "To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and a unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Planning Community as depicted on Map 16.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County to adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations or policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering, shading of parking areas, signage and lighting consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: The Estero Community will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons

that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

~~**Policy 19.1.5:** Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to enhance the Koreshan State Historic Site in such a manner that it is more visually integrated with the Community along US 41 and provides for enhanced pedestrian/bicycle access.~~

Policy 19.1.6: By 2003~~2~~, the Estero Community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting, sidewalks, and insuring safe and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2004 Lee County will evaluate historic resources, and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future County regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture, lighting and signage, and provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Planning Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses must be in compliance with the Retail Commercial Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8). Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential.

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of office and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.5: The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code); free-standing nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges; and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre, and storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

Policy 19.2.6: Lee County encourages commercial developments within the Estero Planning Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Planning Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable housing, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2003~~2~~, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew Road by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

Policy 19.3.4: ~~No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD where it is in high hazard areas in accordance with section 34-784 of the Land Development Code.~~

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide a minimum of a 50' an additional buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas

is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat provided within the Estero Planning Community Boundaries.

- Lee County will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resources within the Estero Planning Community.

Policy 19.4.2: Lee County shall focus acquisition efforts in Estero on environmentally sensitive lands east of I-75 and along the Estero Bay.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions, and zoning approvals.

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: The Estero Community will establish a "document clearing house" in Estero, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations and resolutions will be provided for public inspection. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community must conduct one public informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted within thirty (30) days after the zoning request is submitted, before the application can be found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of

the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Estero Scrub Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a “gateway” at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

Policy 19.6.5: Lee County will assist the Estero Community in identifying and developing a town commons that provides opportunities for public gathering, recreation, civic activities, and the distribution of public services, including a post office, license bureau, tax collectors office, police sub-station and or fire station.

Policy 19.6.6: In order to protect health, safety, welfare and community character, Lee County will continue to monitor truck traffic along Corkscrew Road (from Alico Road to US 41) as a connecting road to US 41 and I-75, to evaluate the impact on adjacent residential communities.

Modifications to current Lee Plan Provisions:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail

uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

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

DATE OF TRANSMITTAL HEARING: August 29, 2001

A. BOARD REVIEW: One Board member expressed concern about the proposed policy, Policy 19.2.1, that would require every potential commercial development requiring rezoning in Estero to be a Commercial Planned Development (CPD). This Board member thought that this type of concept might eventually be applied County-wide, and that it would adversely impact small commercial developers. Staff confirmed and clarified that any commercial rezoning in Estero would have to be rezoned to a CPD if this policy was adopted. Properties could no longer be rezoned to conventional commercial districts in Estero.

This Board member also expressed concern that the proposed Estero plan seemed to be very restrictive on commercial uses, and questioned where the commercial development was going to occur in Estero to support all of the residential growth. The consultant representing the Estero citizens group responded that commercial development will be able to occur at certain nodes (intersections) in the Estero Planning Community. The consultant also pointed out that the new policies promote mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road, which would also allow some level of commercial development. Planning staff then added that there was currently several million square feet of commercial development approved within planned developments in the Estero Planning Community, that has not yet been built. This unbuilt commercial space, plus the future commercial development that can occur in the specified nodes and within mixed use developments, will provide more than enough commercial development to support the existing and future residents of Estero.

There was no public comment on the proposed amendment.

Staff informed the Board that the LPA made a second recommendation for the Board to consider applying the public participation policies (Objective 19.5 and subsequent policies) on a County-wide basis. The Board, however, did not believe that this was the proper forum in which to discuss this item. The Board did not provide any discussion on this issue.

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

- 1. BOARD ACTION:** The Board of County Commissioners voted to transmit the amendment to DCA. The language to be transmitted is the same language that the LPA recommended for transmittal. The language to be transmitted is shown under Part IV, Section D below.

With regard to the issue of applying the public participation policies County-wide, the Board voted, under a separate motion, to table this item to a later date.

- 2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The Board accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff.

C. VOTE (For both motions):

| | |
|-----------------------|------------|
| JOHN ALBION | AYE |
| ANDREW COY | AYE |
| BOB JANES | AYE |
| RAY JUDAH | AYE |
| DOUG ST. CERNY | AYE |

D. LANGUAGE TRANSMITTED BY THE BOCC:

PROPOSED NEW VISION STATEMENT:

21. Estero - "To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and a unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

MODIFICATIONS TO CURRENT LEE PLAN PROVISIONS:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

PROPOSED NEW GOAL, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES:

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Planning Community as depicted on Map 16.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County to adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations or policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering, shading of parking areas, signage and lighting consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: The Estero Community will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Policy 19.1.6: By 2002, the Estero Community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting, sidewalks, and insuring safe and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2004 Lee County will evaluate historic resources, and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future County regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture, lighting and signage, and provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Planning Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses must be in compliance with the Commercial Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8). Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential.

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of office and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.5: The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code); free-standing nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges; and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre.

Policy 19.2.6: Lee County encourages commercial developments within the Estero Planning Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Planning Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable housing, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew Road by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide an additional buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat provided within the Estero Planning Community Boundaries.
- Lee County will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resources within the Estero Planning Community.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions, and zoning approvals.

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: The Estero Community will establish a "document clearing house" in Estero, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations and resolutions will be provided for public inspection. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community must conduct one public informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted before the application can be found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Estero Scrub Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a "gateway" at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

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

DATE OF ORC REPORT: November 21, 2001

A. DCA OBJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

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

B. STAFF RESPONSE

Adopt the amendment as shown in Part I.C. of this report.

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

DATE OF ADOPTION HEARING: January 10, 2002

A. BOARD REVIEW: Planning staff provided an overview of the proposed amendment, highlighting the few changes that have been proposed since the amendment was originally transmitted to DCA. Several members of the Estero Community spoke in favor of adoption of the proposed amendment. The Board commended the Estero Community, and everyone involved for their work in putting together the Estero Community Plan.

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. **BOARD ACTION:** The Board of County Commissioners voted to adopt the amendment, with the changes proposed since the original transmittal to DCA. The amendment was approved as part of the Board's administrative agenda. The final adoption language is shown in Part V, Item D below.
2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The Board accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff.

C. VOTE:

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| JOHN ALBION | <u>AYE</u> |
| ANDREW COY | <u>ABSENT</u> |
| BOB JANES | <u>AYE</u> |
| RAY JUDAH | <u>AYE</u> |
| DOUG ST. CERNY | <u>AYE</u> |

D. FINAL ADOPTION LANGUAGE:

RECOMMENDED TEXT ADDITIONS TO THE LEE PLAN

PROPOSED NEW VISION STATEMENT:

21. Estero - "To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and a unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging.

Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village.”

MODIFICATIONS TO CURRENT LEE PLAN PROVISIONS:

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

PROPOSED NEW GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:

GOAL 19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Planning Community as depicted on Map 16.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County to adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations or policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering, shading of parking areas, signage and lighting consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: The Estero Community will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Policy 19.1.6: By 2002, the Estero Community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting, sidewalks, and insuring safe and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2004 Lee County will evaluate historic resources, and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future County regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture, lighting and signage, and provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Planning Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses must be in compliance with the Commercial Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8).

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of office and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.5: The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code); nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges not associated with a Group III Restaurant; and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre.

Policy 19.2.6: Lee County encourages commercial developments within the Estero Planning Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential

developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Planning Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable housing, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew Road by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide an additional buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat, provided whenever possible, within one mile of the Estero Fire District Boundary.

- Lee County will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resources within the Estero Planning Community.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions, and zoning approvals.

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: The Estero Community will establish a "document clearing house" in Estero, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations and resolutions will be provided for public inspection. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community must conduct one public informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted before the application can be found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Estero Scrub Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a “gateway” at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

**CPA2000-19
BoCC SPONSORED
AMENDMENT
TO THE**

LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

THE LEE PLAN

BoCC Adoption Document
for the
January 10, 2002 Public Hearing

*Lee County Planning Division
1500 Monroe Street
P.O. Box 398
Fort Myers, FL 33902-0398
(941) 479-8585*

November 21, 2001

**LEE COUNTY
DIVISION OF PLANNING
STAFF REPORT FOR
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT
CPA2000-00019**

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: June 18, 2001

PART I - BACKGROUND AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION

A. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

1. SPONSOR/APPLICANT:

A. SPONSOR:

LEE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REPRESENTED BY LEE COUNTY DIVISION OF PLANNING

B. APPLICANT

THE ESTERO COMMUNITY
REPRESENTED BY DAN DELISI
VANASSE AND DAYLOR, LLP

2. REQUEST:

Amend the Lee Plan, text and Future Land Use Map series, to incorporate the recommendations of the Estero Community Planning Effort, establishing a Goal and subsequent Objectives and Policies specific to the Estero Community.

B. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The proposed plan amendment was formally initiated by the Board of County Commissioners on September 19, 2000. Staff recommended that the amendment be initiated by the County as a response to

the concerns of Estero residents about planning and zoning issues arising from recent zoning approvals in the area. This amendment is, however, a grass roots effort originating from the Estero Community, that has been coordinated by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, and the development community. Despite the fact that this was a publicly-initiated amendment, staff has reviewed it as it would a privately-initiated amendment. The Estero Community submitted a set of proposed amendments to the Lee Plan with backup documentation, and staff reviewed and responded to it. The Preliminary Draft of The Estero Community Plan has been included as Attachment 1 of this report. Staff has worked closely with the Estero Community throughout the process in providing comments and recommendations, where appropriate.

Staff believes that the Estero Community planning process originated as a result of a general interest in recent zoning and land use planning issues in the Estero area. Many Estero residents felt that they did not have enough control over the manner in which their community was growing, and believed that the County should do more in its planning efforts to address issues that were specific to the Estero community. The community recognized that Estero was a rapidly growing area within Lee County, and questioned whether existing zoning regulations and growth management policies truly reflected the unique needs of the community. The community decided that some form of action should be taken to ensure that Estero developed in a manner that was consistent with the community vision for the future. The options that were considered ranged from incorporation, to annexing into Bonita Springs, to developing a community plan that would be incorporated into the Lee County Comprehensive Plan. The community took notice of the fact that the idea of creating "sector plans" was gaining popularity in many of the unincorporated places in Lee County, and decided that this was the preferred route to address their concerns. The community, with the assistance of a planning consultant, prepared their own "sector plan" and submitted it to the County with the idea that their recommendations would ultimately be adopted into the Lee Plan. This proposed plan amendment represents the final product of this sector planning process that has developed over the past year.

The community concerns were summarized and categorized into six areas by the planning consultant as follows:

1. **Community Character** - The Community has expressed a desire to implement a stronger community planning approach to proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage, and the location and type of certain land uses.
2. **Residential Land Uses** - The Community identified a desire to maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment of potentially incompatible uses.
3. **Commercial Land Uses** - The community has a strong desire to limit "tourist oriented uses", certain "detrimental uses", and high intensity uses along specific corridors. At the same time, the community expressed a desire for small-scale neighborhood commercial development that services existing neighborhoods.

4. **Natural Resources** - The community expressed a strong desire for extra protection of groundwater resources, wetlands, and other aquatic habitat through acquisition, incentives, and increased regulations.
5. **Public Participation** - The community has requested the opportunity to become more actively and meaningfully involved in the development approval process.
6. **Community Resources** - The community has expressed a desire for the expansion of certain community resources, including a community center, meeting area, and governmental service offices - such as a post office.

The planning consultant drafted a set of goals, objectives, and policies in response to the concerns of the Estero Community. The intent was that these goals, objectives, and policies would eventually be incorporated into the Lee Plan.

Through the course of this plan amendment cycle, planning staff has worked with the Estero Community to resolve the differences that existed between staff and the community at the beginning of the planning process. Staff believes that the final policy language represents an agreeable compromise that will serve the needs of the residents of Estero in guiding growth and development in a manner that is consistent with the community vision.

C. STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ADOPTION

Staff recommends that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the proposed amendment, including the text additions shown below and the changes to Map 16, the Planning Communities Map, to include the new Estero Planning Community boundaries as shown in Attachment 4 of this report.

RECOMMENDED TEXT ADDITIONS TO THE LEE PLAN

PROPOSED NEW VISION STATEMENT:

21. Estero - "To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and a unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

MODIFICATIONS TO CURRENT LEE PLAN PROVISIONS:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

PROPOSED NEW GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:

Changes proposed since the transmittal hearing are shown in strike-out and underline format.

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Planning Community as depicted on Map 16.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County to adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations or policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering, shading of parking areas, signage and lighting consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: The Estero Community will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Policy 19.1.6: By 2002, the Estero Community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting, sidewalks, and insuring safe

and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2004 Lee County will evaluate historic resources, and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future County regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture, lighting and signage, and provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Planning Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses must be in compliance with the Commercial Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8). ~~Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential.~~

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of office and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.5: The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code); ~~free-standing~~ nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges not associated with a Group III Restaurant; and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre.

Policy 19.2.6: Lee County encourages commercial developments within the Estero Planning Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Planning Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable

housing, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew Road by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide an additional buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat, provided whenever possible, within one mile of the Estero Fire District Boundary. ~~within the Estero Planning Community Boundaries.~~
- Lee County will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resources within the Estero Planning Community.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions, and zoning approvals.

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: The Estero Community will establish a "document clearing house" in Estero, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations and resolutions will be provided for public inspection. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community must conduct one public informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted before the application can be found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Estero Scrub Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a "gateway" at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

D. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT

- The proposed amendments to the Lee Plan are based on a collaborative effort between interested citizens of Estero, the Estero Chamber of Commerce, the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, the development community, and Lee County Planning Staff.
- The Estero planning effort originated as a grass-roots effort by citizens of Estero who took an active interest in the County's current policies regarding land use issues in Estero.
- Currently, the Lee Plan contains few regulations that are specific to the Estero Community.
- The Board of County Commissioners has provided financial and political support to community planning efforts in Lee County.
- The Estero Community Plan actively solicited direction from citizens of Estero through two public visioning workshops held on August 15, 2000 and September 19, 2000, as well as through a community-wide informational survey. There was also a great deal of individual communication between Estero residents and their planning consultant. The proposed Lee Plan changes reflect the direction provided by Estero citizens through these visioning processes.
- The Community has expressed a desire to implement a stronger community approach to land use and zoning issues to proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage, and the location of certain land uses.
- The Community identified a desire to maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment.
- The community has a desire to limit "tourist oriented uses", certain "detrimental uses", and high intensity uses along specific corridors. At the same time, the community expressed a desire for small-scale neighborhood commercial development.
- The community expressed a desire for extra protection of groundwater resources, wetlands, and species habitat through acquisition, incentives, and increased regulations.

- The Estero Community has publicly expressed dissatisfaction with the current public notification procedures for zoning actions, plan amendments, and Land Development Code amendments. The community wants additional opportunities to become more involved in the land use planning and zoning process.
- The Estero Community wants to see an expansion of community resources in the area including a community center, meeting area, and government offices.
- Several of the goals, objectives, and policies proposed by the Estero Community call for an increase in the County's core level of service, but have not provided any analysis of the additional costs associated with providing these additional resources. In the absence of such analysis, staff has recommended that such goals, objectives, or policies be modified or deleted to remove the additional resource burden from the County.
- Several of the goals, objectives, and policies proposed by the Estero Community call for the County to regulate lands which are under State control. In such cases, staff has recommended that such goals, objectives, and policies be modified or deleted to clarify that the County does not control these lands.
- The processes of rezoning, Lee Plan amendment, or Land Development Code amendment require one or more public hearings, which require the County to provide public notice by law. The County provides this public notice as part of its core level of service. Any type of additional notification or community outreach activities, such as those desired by the Estero Community, would require the County to commit to raising its current levels of service.

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

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: June 25, 2001

A. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW

Planning staff provided a summary of the proposed amendment, stating that the Estero Community Plan was a cooperative effort between County staff, the Board of County Commissioners, and the Estero Planning Committee. A representative of the Estero planning group also provided an introduction to the proposed amendment.

One member of the LPA made the comment that the term "Estero Community" was being used throughout the report to refer to the geographical area of Estero as well as the community group that was organizing the planning effort. It was suggested that the term "Estero Boundary," or something similar be used to describe the geographical area of Estero. Staff agreed that the language should be modified to clearly distinguish between the community group and the geographical area of Estero.

One member of the public from the Estero area spoke in favor the proposed amendment, and specifically the proposed policies relating to increased public participation in the zoning process (Objective 19.5). This individual stated that the current system of notification was not effective, and did not give interested parties enough time to organize any response to proposed zoning actions.

Staff outlined its concerns with the public participation objective and policies. Staff understood the concerns of the community, and agreed on the importance of having public involvement in the zoning process. Staff was uncomfortable, however, with putting the County in a position where it would have to facilitate and supervise the Estero Community's involvement in the zoning process. Staff asserted that it should not be the responsibility of the County to tell the Estero Community when it should be concerned about an issue. Staff asserted that it should be the community's responsibility to initiate its involvement in zoning issues, and that the role of the County should be to respond to the community when they do have concerns.

Staff also stated that the Land Development Code was recently amended to provide a courtesy notice of zoning actions for surrounding property owners. Additionally, in the near future, these notices will be posted on the County's web site. Staff has been attempting to increase public notification throughout the County, but believes it would be problematic to increase the level of notification in one area, but not in the rest of the County.

The LPA shared staff's concerns about the public participation section and the potential complications that could arise with placing these proposed policies in the Lee Plan.

The representative of the Estero Community agreed with staff's concerns about increasing public notice in one area, but not in the rest of the County. The community representative still thought that the public participation language should remain as the community proposed it. This individual hoped that the Board of County Commissioners would take a comprehensive look at public participation throughout the County.

A member of the public spoke in favor of the proposed amendment. This individual thought that the County should extend its core services to increase public participation, otherwise, Estero would incorporate or annex into Bonita. This individual also spoke in favor of the proposed policies 19.2.5 and 19.4.2.

The LPA expressed some concern over the proposed Policy 19.2.5, and specifically the part about prohibiting uses that have outdoor display in excess of one acre. The LPA thought that this policy would cause problems for existing developments that have such outdoor display, as well as for properties that are zoned for uses that would allow such outdoor display. The LPA questioned whether such properties would be "vested" for the use in question, and whether existing uses of this type would be prohibited from expanding their outdoor storage areas if they exceeded one acre. The LPA asked staff how many existing businesses in Estero had outdoor display in excess of one acre. Staff did not have specific data to respond to this, but did state that they could not think of any off hand.

There was a brief discussion about using the term "lounge" in Policy 19.2.5. This is not a recognized term in the Land Development Code. The terminology in the proposed policy should correspond to the terminology in the Land Development Code.

A member of the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization spoke about proposed Policy 19.6.6, which pertains to monitoring mining truck traffic on Corkscrew Road. Although staff recommended the deletion of this policy, this individual thought the policy was important to promote public safety and preserve community character. A member of Lee County DOT staff responded to these comments. DOT staff recommended the deletion of this policy for a variety of reasons. DOT stated that they already monitor the truck traffic situation on Corkscrew Road, at the direction of the Board of County Commissioners. DOT was uncomfortable with the fact that the policy did not provide any indication of how long the truck traffic monitoring would take place, and that the policy did not account for the possibility that the issue would ever be resolved. Also, DOT staff pointed out that Corkscrew Road is an arterial road which is designed to carry large volumes of traffic, including mining trucks.

Another member of the public spoke extensively about the proposed amendment. He questioned how the proposed Vision Statement language about creating a "village" quality in Estero would impact the proposed regional mall at U.S. 41 and Coconut Road. He also stated that Policy 19.2.2 refers to "retail site location standards," when these standards are commonly referred to as "commercial site location standards." He also questioned whether the special case language modification shown in Policy 6.1.2.1(e) was repeating the other special case language in the proposed Policy 19.2.2. He recommended combining the two proposed policies, if possible. With regard to Policy 19.4.1, which provides for a 50-foot buffer along the Estero River for new development, it was recommended that this policy be placed in the Land Development Code, as it would be the more appropriate place for such specific standards. With regard to Policy 19.5.3, which would require a rezoning applicant to conduct a public workshop, this individual stated that there were too many uncertainties surrounding the policy. He questioned what the public advertising requirements would be for the workshop; where the workshop would be held; who would be responsible for securing a meeting space; who would be responsible for moderating the workshop; and would there be a time limit on the workshop.

The LPA, staff, and the applicant had a general discussion of the issues and concerns raised by the public. The LPA had concerns about the public participation policies and how they would be implemented.

Certain members of the LPA recommended that the policies related to public participation should be applied on a county-wide basis, and not just in the Estero Community.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the LPA thought that there were too many uncertainties relating to Policy 19.2.5, Objective 19.5, Policy 19.5.1, Policy 19.5.2, and Policy 19.5.3. The LPA thought that additional analysis should be conducted on these objectives policies, and requested that staff bring these items back at the subsequent LPA hearing. The LPA did recommend, however, that the Board of County Commissioners transmit the balance of the proposed amendment, with several modifications to staff's proposed language. The specific language changes are shown in Item H. below.

B. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** The LPA recommended that the Board of County Commissioners transmit the proposed amendment with the language changes shown in Item H. below. The recommendation at this hearing did not include transmittal of the proposed Policy 19.2.5, Objective 19.5, Policy 19.5.1, Policy 19.5.2, and Policy 19.5.3. These items were addressed in a separate recommendation at the subsequent LPA hearing.
2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The LPA accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff.

C. VOTE:

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| NOEL ANDRESS | AYE |
| SUSAN BROOKMAN | AYE |
| BARRY ERNST | AYE |
| RONALD INGE | AYE |
| GORDON REIGELMAN | AYE |
| VIRGINIA SPLITT | ABSENT |
| GREG STUART | ABSTAIN |

D. ADDITIONAL LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: July 23, 2001

Subsequent to the June 25th public hearing, staff re-evaluated the policies that the LPA was uncomfortable with, and issued a memo addressing the outstanding issues. A copy of this memo has been included as Attachment 6 of this report. Staff provided a brief summary of the outstanding issues to the LPA, and the LPA provided general discussion.

The LPA was satisfied with the additional analysis and revised staff recommendation on the proposed Policy 19.2.5, which pertains to prohibiting detrimental uses and retail uses with outdoor display.

The LPA still had some concern over the public participation policies (Objective 19.5 and subsequent policies). The LPA questioned whether there would be any procedural requirements for the public workshop required by the proposed Policy 19.5.3. Staff responded that the language in the Lee Plan was general in nature, and that more specific details would be placed in the Land Development Code in the near future to address the specific details of the public workshop. Staff anticipates that new language will be added to the Land Development Code that will address issues such as the level of involvement from the applicant and staff, advertising requirements, and the possible effect of this meeting on zoning applications. It was staff's belief that such details were not appropriate for the Lee Plan.

The LPA questioned what organizations would be empowered to conduct these public workshops. Staff responded that there were no particular organizations that would conduct these meetings. It would be the responsibility of the applicant in each zoning case to conduct this meeting.

A member of the public stated that Policy 19.5.3, as proposed, states that if the public workshop is not conducted within 30 days of submitting the rezoning application, then the rezoning will be found inconsistent with the Lee Plan. This individual questioned if this was staff's intent, and suggested that the 30 day provision might be too stringent of a requirement. In response, staff suggested that the language be changed so that the public workshop must be conducted prior to the application being found sufficient.

A member of the LPA questioned whether staff was concerned about establishing different rules for individual communities, in light of the fact that there are several communities that are currently in the process of developing community plans. Staff responded that the prospect of implementing several sets of regulations has been a concern from the beginning.

The LPA suggested that the proposed policies relating to increased public participation should be applied county-wide, and not just in Estero. This concept had the full support of all LPA members. Staff stated that applying the public participation policies county-wide would probably be beyond the scope of the current plan amendment, but that the LPA could still recommend, through a separate motion, for the Board of County Commissioners to instruct staff to work on applying the new regulations county-wide.

Two members of the public spoke generally in favor of making the public participation policies applicable county-wide.

One member of the LPA stated that it was imperative that the procedural issues relating to the public participation policies be dealt with through Land Development Code amendments, in addition to the proposed Lee Plan amendments. The LPA questioned how they could be assured that appropriate language would be added to the LDC to augment the regulations being proposed through this Plan amendment. Staff responded that if the Board of County Commissioners votes to transmit this amendment, then staff would begin working on the LDC language. Staff also recommended that the LPA recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that they direct staff to initiate the LDC amendments.

One member of the LPA brought up the idea of using email as a means of providing information to Estero residents, and suggested the possibility of adding language to one of the policies that would encourage staff to use email. Staff responded that, with the technology available today, it was a given that email would be used as one method of dispersing the required information to citizens. Staff could provide the

documents and notices through several methods. Staff recommended not adding language about email to the Estero Plan language.

E. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** The LPA recommended that the Board of County Commissioners transmit Policy 19.2.5, Objective 19.5, Policy 19.5.1, Policy 19.5.2, and Policy 19.5.3. Language changes to Policy 19.5.3 were recommended by the LPA as shown in Part H. below. The LPA also made a separate recommendation that the Board of County Commissioners direct staff to refine the procedural requirements embedded in Policy 19.5.1, Policy 19.5.2, and Policy 19.5.3, and amend the Land Development Code to make these procedural requirements applicable on a county-wide basis.
2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The LPA accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff.

F. VOTE (on first motion to transmit the applicable objectives and policies)

| | |
|------------------|----------------|
| NOEL ANDRESS | <u>AYE</u> |
| SUSAN BROOKMAN | <u>AYE</u> |
| BARRY ERNST | <u>AYE</u> |
| RONALD INGE | <u>ABSENT</u> |
| GORDON REIGELMAN | <u>ABSENT</u> |
| VIRGINIA SPLITT | <u>ABSENT</u> |
| GREG STUART | <u>ABSTAIN</u> |

G. VOTE (on second motion to amend the LDC to apply public participation policies county-wide)

| | |
|------------------|---------------|
| NOEL ANDRESS | <u>AYE</u> |
| SUSAN BROOKMAN | <u>AYE</u> |
| BARRY ERNST | <u>AYE</u> |
| RONALD INGE | <u>ABSENT</u> |
| GORDON REIGELMAN | <u>ABSENT</u> |
| VIRGINIA SPLITT | <u>ABSENT</u> |
| GREG STUART | <u>AYE</u> |

H. LANGUAGE TRANSMITTED BY THE LPA:

Note: Changes made to the original language through the LPA hearing process are shown in strike-thru and double-underline format.

Vision Statement:

21. Estero - "To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and a unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Planning Community as depicted on Map 16.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County to adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations or policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering, shading of parking areas, signage and lighting consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: The Estero Community will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons

that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Policy 19.1.5: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to enhance the Koreshan State Historic Site in such a manner that it is more visually integrated with the Community along US 41 and provides for enhanced pedestrian/bicycle access.

Policy 19.1.6: By 2003², the Estero Community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting, sidewalks, and insuring safe and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2004 Lee County will evaluate historic resources, and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future County regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture, lighting and signage, and provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Planning Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses must be in compliance with the Retail Commercial Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8). Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential.

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of office and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.5: The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code); free-standing nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges; and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre, and storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

Policy 19.2.6: Lee County encourages commercial developments within the Estero Planning Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Planning Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable housing, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2003², The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew Road by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

Policy 19.3.4: No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD where it is in high hazard areas in accordance with section 34-784 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide a minimum of a 50' additional buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas

is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat provided within the Estero Planning Community Boundaries.

- Lee County will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resources within the Estero Planning Community.

Policy 19.4.2: Lee County shall focus acquisition efforts in Estero on environmentally sensitive lands east of I-75 and along the Estero Bay.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions, and zoning approvals.

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: The Estero Community will establish a "document clearing house" in Estero, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations and resolutions will be provided for public inspection. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community must conduct one public informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted within thirty (30) days after the zoning request is submitted, before the application can be found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of

the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Estero Scrub Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a “gateway” at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

Policy 19.6.5: Lee County will assist the Estero Community in identifying and developing a town commons that provides opportunities for public gathering, recreation, civic activities, and the distribution of public services, including a post office, license bureau, tax collectors office, police sub-station and or fire station.

Policy 19.6.6: In order to protect health, safety, welfare and community character, Lee County will continue to monitor truck traffic along Corkscrew Road (from Alico Road to US 41) as a connecting road to US 41 and I-75, to evaluate the impact on adjacent residential communities.

Modifications to current Lee Plan Provisions:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail

uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

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

DATE OF TRANSMITTAL HEARING: August 29, 2001

A. BOARD REVIEW: One Board member expressed concern about the proposed policy, Policy 19.2.1, that would require every potential commercial development requiring rezoning in Estero to be a Commercial Planned Development (CPD). This Board member thought that this type of concept might eventually be applied County-wide, and that it would adversely impact small commercial developers. Staff confirmed and clarified that any commercial rezoning in Estero would have to be rezoned to a CPD if this policy was adopted. Properties could no longer be rezoned to conventional commercial districts in Estero.

This Board member also expressed concern that the proposed Estero plan seemed to be very restrictive on commercial uses, and questioned where the commercial development was going to occur in Estero to support all of the residential growth. The consultant representing the Estero citizens group responded that commercial development will be able to occur at certain nodes (intersections) in the Estero Planning Community. The consultant also pointed out that the new policies promote mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road, which would also allow some level of commercial development. Planning staff then added that there was currently several million square feet of commercial development approved within planned developments in the Estero Planning Community, that has not yet been built. This unbuilt commercial space, plus the future commercial development that can occur in the specified nodes and within mixed use developments, will provide more than enough commercial development to support the existing and future residents of Estero.

There was no public comment on the proposed amendment.

Staff informed the Board that the LPA made a second recommendation for the Board to consider applying the public participation policies (Objective 19.5 and subsequent policies) on a County-wide basis. The Board, however, did not believe that this was the proper forum in which to discuss this item. The Board did not provide any discussion on this issue.

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

- 1. BOARD ACTION:** The Board of County Commissioners voted to transmit the amendment to DCA. The language to be transmitted is the same language that the LPA recommended for transmittal. The language to be transmitted is shown under Part IV, Section D below.

With regard to the issue of applying the public participation policies County-wide, the Board voted, under a separate motion, to table this item to a later date.

- 2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The Board accepted the findings of fact as advanced by staff.

C. VOTE (For both motions):

| | |
|-----------------------|------------|
| JOHN ALBION | AYE |
| ANDREW COY | AYE |
| BOB JANES | AYE |
| RAY JUDAH | AYE |
| DOUG ST. CERNY | AYE |

D. LANGUAGE TRANSMITTED BY THE BOCC:

PROPOSED NEW VISION STATEMENT:

21. Estero - "To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and a unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

MODIFICATIONS TO CURRENT LEE PLAN PROVISIONS:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

PROPOSED NEW GOAL, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES:

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Planning Community as depicted on Map 16.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County to adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations or policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering, shading of parking areas, signage and lighting consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: The Estero Community will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Policy 19.1.6: By 2002, the Estero Community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting, sidewalks, and insuring safe and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2004 Lee County will evaluate historic resources, and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future County regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture, lighting and signage, and provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Planning Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses must be in compliance with the Commercial Site Location Standards. A finding of a Special Case must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8). Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential.

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of office and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.5: The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: detrimental uses (as defined in the Land Development Code); free-standing nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges; and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre.

Policy 19.2.6: Lee County encourages commercial developments within the Estero Planning Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Planning Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable housing, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew Road by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide an additional buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat provided within the Estero Planning Community Boundaries.
- Lee County will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resources within the Estero Planning Community.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions, and zoning approvals.

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: The Estero Community will establish a document clearing house in Estero, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations and resolutions will be provided for public inspection. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community must conduct one public informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted before the application can be found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Estero Scrub Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a gateway at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

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

DATE OF ORC REPORT: November 21, 2001

A. DCA OBJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

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

B. STAFF RESPONSE

Adopt the amendment as shown in Part I.C. of this report.

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

DATE OF ADOPTION HEARING: January 10, 2002

A. BOARD REVIEW:

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. BOARD ACTION:

2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:

C. VOTE:

JOHN ALBION

ANDREW COY

BOB JANES

RAY JUDAH

DOUG ST. CERNY

**CPA2000-19
BoCC SPONSORED
AMENDMENT
TO THE**

LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

THE LEE PLAN

LPA Public Hearing Document
for the
June 25th, 2001 Public Hearing

*Lee County Planning Division
1500 Monroe Street
P.O. Box 398
Fort Myers, FL 33902-0398
(941) 479-8585*

June 18, 2001

**LEE COUNTY
DIVISION OF PLANNING
STAFF REPORT FOR
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT
CPA2000-00019**

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: June 18, 2001

PART I - BACKGROUND AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION

A. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

1. SPONSOR/APPLICANT:

A. SPONSOR:

LEE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REPRESENTED BY LEE COUNTY DIVISION OF PLANNING

B. APPLICANT

THE ESTERO COMMUNITY
REPRESENTED BY DAN DELISI
VANASSE AND DAYLOR, LLP

2. REQUEST:

Amend the Lee Plan, text and Future Land Use Map series, to incorporate the recommendations of the Estero Community Planning Effort, establishing a Goal and subsequent Objectives and Policies specific to the Estero Community.

B. STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** Planning staff recommends that the Board of County Commissioners transmit the proposed amendment, with the modifications proposed by staff. Staff's recommended language is provided below, with recommended changes from the applicant's language highlighted in strike-thru, double underline format.

Vision Statement:

21. Estero - "To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

Syntax ?

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Community as depicted on Map 16.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County to adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations or policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering, shading of parking areas, signage consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards. lighting

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: ~~Lee County and t~~The Estero Community ~~shall~~ will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town

Night Club 8778

commons that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Policy 19.1.5: ~~Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to enhance the Koreshan State Historic Site in such a manner that it is more visually integrated with the Community along US 41 and provides for enhanced pedestrian/bicycle access.~~

Policy 19.1.6: By 2003², the Estero Community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting, sidewalks, and insuring safe and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2003⁴ Lee County will evaluate historic resources, to be adopted and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future County regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture and signage, and provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources. lighting

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development. boundaries

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses ~~shall~~ must be in compliance with the ^{Commercial} ~~Retail~~ Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8). Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential. Policy 6.1.2

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage or incentivize mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County shall will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of service office and residential uses.

Contd to July

Policy 19.2.5: The Estero Community will propose regulations for Lee County to review, amend or adopt that prohibits "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code), free-standing nightclubs or lounges, or retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre, and

storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

Policy 19.2.6: By the end of 2002, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that encourages commercial developments within the Estero Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County shall must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable housing, and retail uses in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 200³, The Estero Community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County shall will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew Road by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

Policy 19.3.4: No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD where it is in high hazard areas in accordance with section 34-784 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County shall will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries shall must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development ^{approvals} adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide a minimum of a 50' buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies. *an additional*

- Lee County shall encourage that when off-site mitigation of indigenous areas, wetland impacts or wildlife habitat impacts is approved for site development that the mitigation will be provided within the Estero Community Boundaries. will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat provided within the Estero Community Boundaries.
- Lee County shall will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resources within the Estero Community.

✓ **Policy 19.4.2:** Lee County shall focus acquisition efforts in Estero on environmentally sensitive lands east of I-75 and along the Estero Bay.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County shall will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, and zoning approvals, and development orders.

Policy 19.5.1: Lee County shall register groups within the Estero Community that desire notification of pending review of ~~ordinances~~, development code amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates.

Policy 19.5.2: Lee County shall establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Community, ~~in coordination with zoning staff,~~ shall must conduct one public workshop within two weeks of the project being found sufficient.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County shall will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: Lee County and ~~t~~The Estero Community shall will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Sahdev Property Estero Scrub

Estero Community vs Estero boundary

Transmit
LDCA
LPA
MCP
Normative
Location MCP
App Form



Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a "gateway" at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

Policy 19.6.5: Lee County will assist the Estero Community in identifying and developing a town commons that provides opportunities for public gathering, recreation, civic activities, and the distribution of public services, including a post office, license bureau, tax collectors office, police sub-station and or fire station.

Specy deleted
Policy 19.6.6: In order to protect health, safety, welfare and community character, Lee County will continue to monitor truck traffic along Corkscrew Road (from Alico Road to US 41) as a connecting road to US 41 and I-75, to evaluate the impact on adjacent residential communities.

Modifications to current Lee Plan Provisions:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:

- The proposed amendments to the Lee Plan are based on a collaborative effort between interested citizens of Estero, the Estero Chamber of Commerce, the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, the development community, and Lee County Planning Staff.
- The Estero planning effort originated as a grass-roots effort by citizens of Estero who took an active interest in the County's current policies regarding land use issues in Estero.
- Currently, the Lee Plan contains few regulations that are specific to the Estero Community.
- The Board of County Commissioners has provided financial and political support to community planning efforts in Lee County.
- The Estero Community Plan actively solicited direction from citizens of Estero through two public visioning workshops held on August 15, 2000 and September 19, 2000, as well as through a community-wide informational survey. There was also a great deal of individual communication between Estero residents and their planning consultant. The proposed Lee Plan changes reflect the direction provided by Estero citizens through these visioning processes.
- The Community has expressed a desire to implement a stronger community approach to land use and zoning issues to proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage, and the location of certain land uses.
- The Community identified a desire to maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment.
- The community has a desire to limit "tourist oriented uses", certain "detrimental uses", and high intensity uses along specific corridors. At the same time, the community expressed a desire for small-scale neighborhood commercial development.
- The community expressed a desire for extra protection of groundwater resources, wetlands, and species habitat through acquisition, incentives, and increased regulations.
- The Estero Community has publicly expressed dissatisfaction with the current public notification procedures for zoning actions, plan amendments, and Land Development Code amendments. The community wants additional opportunities to become more involved in the land use planning and zoning process.
- The Estero Community wants to see an expansion of community resources in the area including a community center, meeting area, and government offices.
- Several of the goals, objectives, and policies proposed by the Estero Community call for an increase in the County's core level of service, but have not provided any analysis of the additional costs associated with providing these additional resources. In the absence of such analysis, staff

has recommended that such goals, objectives, or policies be modified or deleted to remove the additional resource burden from the County.

- Several of the goals, objectives, and policies proposed by the Estero Community call for the County to regulate lands which are under State control. In such cases, staff has recommended that such goals, objectives, and policies be modified or deleted to clarify that the County does not control these lands.
- The processes of rezoning, Lee Plan amendment, or Land Development Code amendment require one or more public hearings, which require the County to provide public notice by law. The County provides this public notice as part of its core level of service. Any type of additional notification or community outreach activities, such as those desired by the Estero Community, would require the County to commit to raising its current levels of service.

C. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The proposed plan amendment was formally initiated by the Board of County Commissioners on September 19, 2000. Staff recommended that the amendment be initiated by the County as a response to the concerns of Estero residents about planning and zoning issues arising from recent zoning approvals in the area. This amendment is, however, a grass roots effort originating from the Estero Community, that has been coordinated by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, and the development community. Despite the fact that this was a publicly-initiated amendment, staff has reviewed it as it would a privately-initiated amendment. The Estero Community submitted a set of proposed amendments to the Lee Plan with backup documentation, and staff reviewed and responded to it. The Preliminary Draft of The Estero Community Plan has been included as Attachment 1 of this report. Staff has worked closely with the Estero Community throughout the process in providing comments and recommendations, where appropriate.

Staff believes that the Estero Community planning process originated as a result of a general interest in recent zoning and land use planning issues in the Estero area. Many Estero residents felt that they did not have enough control over the manner in which their community was growing, and believed that the County should do more in its planning efforts to address issues that were specific to the Estero community. One case in particular seemed to be the catalyst for the Estero planning effort, and that was the Estero Greens CPD and its subsequent appeal proceedings. In September of 1997, the Board of County Commissioners approved the Estero Greens CPD, which granted approval for 100,000 square feet of retail uses; or 129,900 square feet of office uses; or a 145-unit ACLF; or a 125-room hotel; or some combination of these uses on a 24-acre parcel of land. Vehicle and Equipment Dealers Group I, which would allow a typical car or truck dealership, was one of the uses permitted to occur on the property. The Estero Greens CPD is located adjacent to Fountain Lakes, which is an existing residential development.

Lee County received a letter from the representative of a prospective buyer of property within Estero Greens requesting an official zoning verification letter from the County. The applicant wanted to know whether the development of a 10-acre car dealership on the property would be consistent with the current zoning and applicable provisions of the Lee Plan. The County issued an official zoning verification letter stating that the proposed 10-acre vehicle dealership did not constitute "Neighborhood Commercial" development because it would typically draw customers from outside the immediate neighborhood. The

letter stated that the proposed use would constitute "Community Commercial" development, making it inconsistent with the Suburban land use category, meaning that it could not be developed under the existing zoning and land use designation.

The applicant filed an administrative appeal of the decision made through the zoning verification letter. Staff maintained that its original interpretation be upheld. The Hearing Examiner, however, did not uphold staff's interpretation and granted the appeal based on the finding that the County had already found Vehicle and Equipment Dealers Group I to be a permissible use in the Suburban land use category and that, as long as the use does not exceed 100,000 square feet and is confined to 10 acres or less, it met the definition of "Neighborhood Commercial." This decision by the Hearing Examiner found that the proposed 10-acre car dealership would be consistent with the Suburban land use category, and essentially granted permission for the car dealership to be developed on the property.

This decision was subsequently appealed to circuit court by the Board of County Commissioners. Upon considering the appeal, the Circuit Court judge denied the County's appeal of the Hearing Examiner Decision. This meant that the Hearing Examiner decision controlled, and that the subject property could be developed with an auto dealership as long as it did not exceed 100,000 square feet on 10 acres of land.

Residents of Estero closely followed the proceedings that were outlined above. The subject property was directly adjacent to an existing residential development, Fountain Lakes. Residents of Fountain Lakes and other areas of Estero took notice of this case, and were unhappy that the County approved a car dealership, with few limitations on intensity, adjacent to an established residential development. This case caused the Estero Community to take a closer look at the way the community was developing. The community recognized that Estero was a rapidly growing area within Lee County, and questioned whether existing zoning regulations and growth management policies truly reflected the unique needs of the community. The community decided that some form of action should be taken to ensure that Estero developed in a manner that was consistent with the community vision for the future. The options that were considered ranged from incorporation, to annexing into Bonita Springs, to developing a community plan that would be incorporated into the Lee County Comprehensive Plan. The community took notice of the fact that the idea of creating "sector plans" was gaining popularity in many of the unincorporated places in Lee County, and decided that this was the preferred route to address their concerns. The community, with the assistance of a planning consultant, prepared their own "sector plan" and submitted it to the County with the idea that their recommendations would ultimately be adopted into the Lee Plan. This proposed plan amendment represents the final product of this sector planning process that has developed over the past year.

PART II - STAFF ANALYSIS

A. STAFF DISCUSSION

The Estero Community Plan began as a grass-roots effort to address concerns about the general quality of life in Estero, and how the community might grow in the future. The effort was coordinated by representatives of the Estero Chamber of Commerce, the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, and the development community. The community also hired a private planning firm to help coordinate the planning process. The private planning firm that represented the community actively solicited direction from citizens of Estero through two public visioning workshops held on August 15, 2000 and September

19, 2000, as well as through a community-wide informational survey. A copy of this survey has been included as Attachment 2 of this report. There were also many instances of direct communication between interested citizens and the consultant. The proposed Lee Plan changes reflect the concerns of Estero residents that came to light through this planning process.

The community concerns have been summarized and categorized into six areas by the planning consultant as follows:

1. **Community Character** - The Community has expressed a desire to implement a stronger community planning approach to proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage, and the location and type of certain land uses.
2. **Residential Land Uses** - The Community identified a desire to maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment of potentially incompatible uses.
3. **Commercial Land Uses** - The community has a strong desire to limit "tourist oriented uses", certain "detrimental uses", and high intensity uses along specific corridors. At the same time, the community expressed a desire for small-scale neighborhood commercial development that services existing neighborhoods.
4. **Natural Resources** - The community expressed a strong desire for extra protection of groundwater resources, wetlands, and other aquatic habitat through acquisition, incentives, and increased regulations.
5. **Public Participation** - The community has requested the opportunity to become more actively and meaningfully involved in the development approval process.
6. **Community Resources** - The community has expressed a desire for the expansion of certain community resources, including a community center, meeting area, and governmental service offices - such as a post office.

The planning consultant drafted a set of goals, objectives, and policies in response to the concerns of the Estero Community. The intent was that these goals, objectives, and policies would eventually be incorporated into the Lee Plan.

Staff's initial concerns were contained in an April 18, 2001 insufficiency letter (see Attachment 3). Some of staff's concerns that were expressed in this letter have still not been addressed by the applicant, although many of them have. Certain parts of the proposed "Community Plan" put a great deal of burden on the County while not identifying any additional resources to address the desired increase in service levels. This was one of staff's greatest concerns with the proposed goals, objectives, and policies. The County maintains a "core" level of service, and any increase to that level of service, as is being requested by the Estero Community, must be accompanied by the provision of additional County resources. The application materials did not provide any estimates of the costs associated with these additional resources or any possible funding sources.

Another general concern expressed in the insufficiency letter was the fact that many of the proposed goals, objectives and policies were not accompanied by sufficient data and analysis in support of the proposed changes. Any amendment to the Lee Plan must be accompanied by data, analysis, or justification that demonstrates a need for the amendment, and that the amendment is based on sound planning principles. This data and analysis was missing for certain portions of the proposed Estero Community Plan. Another concern expressed in the initial sufficiency letter was that some of the proposed policies were requiring Lee County to do things that were outside of the County's control or were internally inconsistent with the Lee Plan or the Lee County Land Development Code (LDC).

The community did not formally respond to many of staff's initial concerns, but through several informal meetings, many of the issues were resolved. Community representatives provided staff with revised policy language that partially addressed staff's initial concerns. Some policies were deleted and others were modified. Staff's analysis is in response to the applicant's latest proposed language as shown below. In the following paragraphs, staff has analyzed the proposed goals, objectives and policies where there is still disagreement between staff and the applicant, or where staff has recommended modified language from what the applicant has proposed. For those proposed goals, objectives, and policies not highlighted in the following paragraphs, it can be assumed that staff and the applicant are in agreement.

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process. This Goal and subsequent objectives and policies apply to the Estero Community as depicted on Map 16.

Staff has recommended the addition of the last sentence in order to better define the area to which Goal 19 and its subsequent objectives and policies will apply. Staff is recommending that a new planning community be established for Estero, rather than leaving Estero in the current "San Carlos/Estero" Planning Community. Staff believes that the establishment of a new Estero Planning Community will help create a unique identity for the Estero Community. It also provides a specific geographic area within which Goal 19 will apply, which will prevent future confusion. The new Estero Community will be depicted on the amended Planning Communities Map 16 of the Lee Plan. A map depicting the proposed boundaries of the Estero Planning Community has been included as Attachment 4 of this report.

Policy 19.1.4: ~~Lee County and~~ The Estero Community shall will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons that encourage the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Staff believes that the establishment of a town commons, and what it might contain is outside of the County's land use planning functions. The things that are being requested in this policy are mainly private development issues. The County cannot control the location of post offices or medical providers. The location of these facilities are market driven. Recreational opportunities are already provided through the County's Parks and Recreation Department. The provision of governmental offices, an outdoor plaza, and a public meeting hall would require additional capital expenditure by the County. It would also require

the dedication of additional resources to manage the acquisition and development efforts. Planning staff, therefore, is not in a position to facilitate the acquisition of land for the subsequent construction of additional public buildings or outdoor gathering areas. Staff has recommended that the proposed policy be reworded to remove this responsibility from the County, and place it on the Estero Community. Given that the Estero Chamber of Commerce is heavily involved in this planning effort, planning staff believes that they would be the ideal organization to facilitate the development of the town commons. Additionally, staff believes that there are several properties in the Estero area, that have approved zoning or are currently undergoing rezoning, that could accommodate a town commons type of atmosphere.

~~**Policy 19.1.5:** Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to enhance the Koreshan State Historic Site in such a manner that it is more visually integrated with the Community along US 41 and provides for enhanced pedestrian/bicycle access:~~

Staff believes that the proposed Policy 19.1.5 essentially repeats proposed Policy 19.6.2, and should be deleted in its entirety.

~~**Policy 19.1.7:** By 2003⁴ Lee County will evaluate historic resources, to be adopted and draft a proposal for their designation under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.~~

Staff believes that additional time would be needed to evaluate historic resources within Estero, and has recommended that the proposed completion year be moved back from 2003 to 2004. Also, there is no guarantee that any historic resources will be eligible to be “adopted” under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code. Staff believes, therefore, that it would be more appropriate to simply require the County to evaluate potential historic resources, and draft a proposal for any appropriate resources to receive some type of historic designation under Chapter 22.

~~**Policy 19.2.3:** By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage or incentivize mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.~~

Staff believes that “incentivize” is not a real word. The applicant also has not proposed any specific incentives, so staff recommends that the word “incentivize” be deleted.

~~**Policy 19.2.4:** With the exception of the Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County shall will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of service office and residential uses.~~

Staff has recommended that “service” be changed to “office” because “service” is not generally recognized as a separate use type in Lee Plan regulations. This recommendation is simply to be consistent with other portions of the Lee Plan. The Lee Plan generally recognizes two types of commercial development: “retail” and “office”.

~~**Policy 19.2.5:** The Estero Community will propose regulations for Lee County to review, amend or adopt that prohibits “detrimental uses” (as defined in the Land Development Code), free-standing nightclubs or lounges, or retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre, and~~

storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

Staff believes that this policy would be more effective if it simply prohibited the detrimental uses from occurring as specified in the proposed policy. Staff believes that the policy, as proposed, would not necessarily accomplish its underlying intent. Staff believes the policy would be more effective as modified above.

Policy 19.2.6: ~~By the end of 2002, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that encourages commercial developments within the Estero Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.~~

Staff believes that this policy should be an outright requirement, and not something that will require the future adoption of additional regulations. Staff has modified the proposed policy so that it will have more of an immediate impact to meet the underlying intent.

Policy 19.3.1: ~~In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, including affordable housing, and retail uses in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.~~

Staff notes that this proposed policy directly conflicts with the proposed Policy 19.2.4, which discourages new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway. Policy 19.3.1 seems to encourage new retail uses to occur along Three Oaks, while the proposed Policy 19.2.4 discourages retail uses, except at the Nodes identified on Map 19. Staff confirms that the intent of the Estero Community is to discourage retail uses along Three Oaks, and not to encourage them. Staff therefore recommends that the reference to retail uses be deleted from the proposed Policy 19.3.1.

Policy 19.3.4: ~~No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD where it is in high hazard areas in accordance with section 34-784 of the Land Development Code.~~

Staff believes that this policy conflicts with existing regulations. Policy 80.1.2 of the Lee Plan states that the County will not permit new or expanded mobile home or recreational vehicle development on barrier islands or in V-zones as defined by FEMA. LDC Section 34-784 states essentially the same thing, with the exception that it only applies to recreational vehicle (RV) parks and not mobile home parks. Staff disagrees with the inclusion of this proposed policy because it would be inconsistent with the existing Lee Plan Policy 80.1.2 and LDC Section 34-784. Staff, therefore, is recommending the deletion of this proposed policy.

Policy 19.4.1: ~~By the end of 2003, Lee County shall will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:~~

- Lee County shall encourage that when off-site mitigation of indigenous areas, wetland impacts or wildlife habitat impacts is approved for site development that the mitigation will be provided within the Estero Community Boundaries. will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat provided within the Estero Community Boundaries.

The County does not determine where wetland mitigation occurs per Florida Statutes, therefore, the County cannot create a Lee Plan policy that regulates wetland impact mitigation. Staff recommends that the proposed policy delete the reference to wetland mitigation. The County does, however, have control over the preservation of indigenous areas and listed species habitat, and staff believes that this aspect of the proposed policy should remain in place. Staff has recommended modifications to the policy as shown above.

~~Policy 19.4.2:~~ Lee County shall focus acquisition efforts in Estero on environmentally sensitive lands east of I-75 and along the Estero Bay.

Staff believes that this policy would conflict with the County's Conservation 2020 program which focuses its acquisition efforts on a county-wide basis. This program is a willing-seller acquisition program, meaning that the County does not pursue the acquisition of Conservation 2020 property through its legal power of Eminent Domain. Potential acquisition sites are nominated for consideration under the Conservation 2020 program, and then they are considered for acquisition by the Lee County Conservation Land Acquisition and Stewardship Advisory Committee (CLASAC). This program prioritizes potential properties for acquisition based on several criteria that pertain to the value of the environmental resources on the property. The creation of the proposed Policy 19.4.2 would conflict with the Conservation 2020 program by assigning priority to certain areas in Estero, when all nominated properties are reviewed under the same criteria regardless of their location. Staff does not want to possibly preclude the acquisition of higher quality lands elsewhere in the County because of this policy. Staff believes that the highest quality lands should be the focus of acquisition efforts, regardless of their location. For this reason, staff has recommended that the proposed policy be deleted.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County shall will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, and zoning approvals, and development orders.

The County does not solicit public input on development orders because they are designated as administrative approvals under Chapter 10 of the Land Development Code. Development orders do not require advertising, notification or public hearing requirements. A development order generally involves engineered drawings that are reviewed by the County to determine if the site has been designed and engineered according to specific Land Development Code requirements. When the county receives a development order application, the subject property has already been zoned for the type of use being requested on the development order plans. Staff, therefore, recommends that the proposed Objective 19.5 remove the reference to development orders. Staff recommends the modified Objective 19.5 as shown above.

~~**Policy 19.5.1:** Lee County shall register groups within the Estero Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, development code amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates.~~

Lee County already has a procedure where it provides notices of pending rezoning cases to a limited number of legitimate groups in Estero area, as well as other areas of Lee County. This is done by the County as a courtesy in addition to the advertising and notification that is required by law. It would put a significant strain on the County's resources to summarize each case and mail out documents to any registered group. This would require resources to be allocated for tasks that go beyond the County's core level of service. Staff has recommended the deletion of this proposed policy.

~~**Policy 19.5.2:** Lee County shall establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available.~~

This proposed policy would require the dedication of significant staff time to establish, organize, and maintain a collection of documents in whatever location would be established for the document clearing house. The County is not currently in a position to dedicate additional resources to this cause. The County is, however, always willing to share any public information or documents with any interested party via fax, email, or in-person. The applicant also has not provided any kind of analysis of the costs that would be associated with establishing and maintaining such a facility. Staff therefore recommends the deletion of this proposed policy.

~~**Policy 19.5.3:** The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Community, in coordination with zoning staff, shall must conduct one public workshop within two weeks of the project being found sufficient.~~

Staff generally agrees with the inclusion of this policy in the Lee Plan, but does not want to obligate zoning staff to participate in and coordinate all of these public workshops. Staff believes it would be beneficial for the agent and interested citizens to discuss issues relating to a planned development prior to any public hearing because many issues could be resolved in this forum, which would reduce the complexity of the formal public hearings. In most cases, the County zoning staff would likely participate in these public forums on a voluntary basis in order to ensure that the proposed development was accurately represented to the community. Staff believes, however, that the agent for the planned development should be primarily responsible for coordinating the public workshop because, if for some reason the zoning staff member was unable to participate in these numerous workshops, then the County could be found to be not in compliance with its comprehensive plan. Staff has recommended that the proposed policy remain in place, but that the obligation of zoning staff to coordinate the public forum be removed.

~~**Policy 19.6.1:** Lee County and the Estero Community shall will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Sandev Property Estero Scrub Preserve, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.~~

The Sahdev Property is now known as the "Estero Scrub Preserve". Staff recommends that the reference be changed in the proposed Policy 19.6.1. Also, since the property is under state control now, Lee County has no control over its management and development. Staff, therefore, recommends the deletion of Lee County's involvement in the policy direction. As a side note, if any Estero residents want to become involved in the development of the Estero Bay preserves, they can join a group known as the Estero Bay Buddies, which provides input in the development of the preserves.

Policy 19.6.2: ~~Lee County and t~~The Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of the Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a "gateway" at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, or programmed activities for the community.

Lee County does not control the development or management of the Koreshan State Historic Site. The property is developed and managed by the State of Florida. Staff disagrees with the County's involvement in this proposed policy because it could result in the County being obligated to provide enhancements to a property that it does not control. Staff, however, does not want to preclude members of the Estero Community from giving their input to the State on the possible enhancement of the historic site. Also, the Koreshan State Park can be contacted for volunteer opportunities for interested citizens. Staff has recommended that the proposed policy be reworded to eliminate the County's involvement in the enhancement of the Koreshan State Historic Site.

Policy 19.6.5: ~~Lee County will assist the Estero Community in identifying and developing a town commons that provides opportunities for public gathering, recreation, civic activities, and the distribution of public services, including a post office, license bureau, tax collectors office, police sub-station and or fire station.~~

This policy states essentially the same thing as proposed Policy 19.1.4, therefore staff is recommending that it be deleted in its entirety.

Policy 19.6.6: ~~In order to protect health, safety, welfare and community character, Lee County will continue to monitor truck traffic along Corkscrew Road (from Alico Road to US 41) as a connecting road to US 41 and I-75, to evaluate the impact on adjacent residential communities.~~

Lee County DOT has reviewed the proposed Goals, Objectives, and Policies for the Estero Community Plan, and has provided comments concerning this proposed Policy (see Attachment 5). Their concern is that the policy deals with an operational issue at a specific location, with no identified time frame for how long the monitoring would continue. Lee County DOT currently monitors specific problem locations around the County on an as-needed basis, and they are currently monitoring the truck traffic situation on Corkscrew Road. This monitoring will likely continue until the problem gets resolved. The proposed policy requires perpetual monitoring and ignores the fact that the problem will get resolved at some point in the future. The perpetual monitoring at this one location would restrict the ability of DOT to monitor other problem areas in the future. The correspondence from DOT also indicates that there are several physical improvements planned for Corkscrew Road in the near future, including turn lane additions, four-laning, the addition of paved shoulders, and the installation of new traffic signals. DOT staff believe that

the perpetual monitoring is overly burdensome and unnecessary in light of their current monitoring efforts and the future improvements planned for Corkscrew Road.

B. CONCLUSIONS

The proposed goals, objectives, and policies are the result of a year long planning process. They directly reflect the vision that the Estero Community has for its future growth and development. Staff believes that this amendment should be viewed as a first step in a continuous process that addresses planning needs in Estero. Many issues have been addressed through this amendment, but there are others, such as those policies (or portions thereof) that staff has recommended for deletion, that will require more consideration in the future. The initial establishment of Goal 19 of the Lee Plan is the important first step that will open the door to address other land use planning issues in Estero as they arise.

C. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board of County Commissioners transmit the proposed amendment with staff's recommended language as shown in Part I, Section B.1 of this report. Staff also recommends that Map 16, the Planning Communities Map, be amended to include the new Estero Planning Community boundaries as shown in Attachment 4 of this report.

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

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: June 25, 2001

A. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW

**B. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT
SUMMARY**

1. RECOMMENDATION:

2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:

C. VOTE:

NOEL ANDRESS

Mue

SUSAN BROOKMAN

✓

BARRY ERNST

RONALD INGE

2nd

GORDON REIGELMAN

VIRGINIA SPLITT

GREG STUART

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

DATE OF TRANSMITTAL HEARING: _____

A. BOARD REVIEW:

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. BOARD ACTION:

2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:

C. VOTE:

JOHN ALBION

ANDREW COY

BOB JANES

RAY JUDAH

DOUG ST. CERNY

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

DATE OF ORC REPORT: _____

A. DCA OBJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

B. STAFF RESPONSE

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

DATE OF ADOPTION HEARING: _____

A. BOARD REVIEW:

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. BOARD ACTION:

2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:

C. VOTE:

JOHN ALBION

ANDREW COY

BOB JANES

RAY JUDAH

DOUG ST. CERNY

PRELIMINARY DRAFT: The Estero Community Plan

Establishing a Guiding Vision for the Future

An Application for Amendment of the
Lee County Comprehensive Plan

September 29, 2000

Prepared for:

Estero Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Box 588
Estero, FL 33928
Phone: (941) 948-7990
Fax: (941) 498-4218
contact@estero.org

and

The Citizens of Estero

Prepared by:

Mitchel A. Hutchcraft, ASLA, AICP
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
12730 New Brittany Boulevard.
Suite 600
Fort Myers, Florida 33907

With Input from:

The Estero Community Plan Committee
Meg Vencellar, Estero Chamber of Commerce
Eddie Perry, Estero Civic Association
Neal Noethlich, ECCO
Don Eslick, ECCO
David Graham, Bonita Bay Properties
Frank Weed, West Bay Club

ATTACHMENT 1

The Citizens of Estero

Section One: Background

The Estero Community Plan process was generated by a grass roots effort and coordinated by the Estero Chamber of Commerce through the direction of the Committee that provided equal representation to members of the Chamber, the Civic Association, the development community, and the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization (ECCO).

The Community Plan is partially funded by Lee County through a matching grant program, while the remaining fees are funded through a combination of private contributions and funds managed by the Estero Chamber of Commerce.

The Estero Community Plan actively solicited input and direction from the residents of Estero through two public visioning workshops held on August 15, 2000 and September 19, 2000. The Community Plan will include four phases, as outlined below:

- Phase I:** Phase I is a preliminary evaluation of the major issues facing the future growth management of the Estero Community. This evaluation will include collection of data and analysis, public input and coordination with Lee County representatives. The result of this initial effort will be the establishment of a Community Vision Statement, and the submission of a Lee County Comprehensive Plan Amendment to add Goals, Objectives and Policies to the Lee Plan to provide additional direction in evaluating future development approval requests.
- Phase II:** Phase II includes the preparation of detailed Land Development Code Regulations addressing issues ranging from landscaping and signage, to the development approval process itself. It is anticipated that Phase II may include some detailed master planning for key areas within the community, resulting from direction incorporated in Phase I. Phase II is anticipated to begin October 2000, with approval anticipated in early 2001.
- Phase III:** Phase III is anticipated to include very specific amendments to the Future Land Use Map of the Lee Plan. This may include the identification of necessary roadway improvements, modifications to land use categories, and the creation of specific land use overlays. This Phase will be a detailed evaluation, and will build upon the foundation established by the Phase I amendments. Phase III is preliminarily scheduled for submittal in September of 2001, with approval expected the fall of 2002.

DRAFT

Section Two: Intent

The Estero Community Plan Phase I aims to begin addressing the future growth, character and quality of life within the Estero Community by adopting guiding principles into the Lee Plan. These guiding principles will provide direction on land use and infrastructure decisions, thereby ensuring that future development remain consistent with the stated vision of the community, and encourage approved development to strive towards achieving these goals.

This amendment marks an important first step in a long-term process. The provisions recommended by this Community Plan will guide the development of future Land Development Code regulations, as well as future site specific Land Use Map Amendments. As identified above, the anticipated schedule for Phase I includes submittal by September 29, 2000, with adoption expected by the fall of 2001.

Section Three: Process

The following section outlines the process that was followed in the preparation of the recommendations associated with Phase I of the Estero Community Plan. It is important to note that this process was intentionally compressed in order to meet the September 29, 2000 deadline. Therefore, much of the data and analysis is based on existing information, development approvals or projections. However, there was a significant effort to obtain community input from residents and Key Stakeholders to identify community issues, concerns and desires.

1. Identification of Key Community Issues

Based on preliminary input from the Estero Chamber of Commerce, ECCO, the Lee County Department of Community Development, and personal contact with the residents of Estero, Vanasse & Daylor established the following Key Community issues as underlying concepts for the first phase of the Estero Community Plan.

- **Community Character**

Identify what issues the community feels are important for the protection and/or enhancement of the beauty, quality of life and visual impact of Estero.

- **Residential Land Uses**

Determine areas within Estero that the community should encourage for residential uses and begin to discuss the desired character, density and community interface.

- **Commercial Land Uses**

Determine areas within Estero that the community should encourage or discourage for commercial uses, and begin to discuss the desired character, intensity and community interface. Further, we received input on what uses the residents perceive as inappropriate due to their potential lack of compatibility with the community vision.

- **Natural Resources**

Identify natural resources within Estero that should be considered for public access, protection, enhancement or acquisition.

- **Public Participation**

Solicit input from the Community on how to best provide more meaningful public participation opportunities during the development approval process. Ideally, this concept should provide more direct input to the developers on community expectations, as well as provide developers with more certainty in respect to community support. A copy of the Estero Community Plan Questionnaire is attached in Appendix A.

2. Preliminary Evaluation of Existing Conditions:

In order to maintain the schedule to submit the necessary documentation by the September 29, 2000 deadline, Vanasse & Daylor undertook an abbreviated Evaluation of Existing Conditions. This included identification of the Community Boundaries, a review of the FLUM categories and permitted uses, the approved Planned Development Zonings (including uses, intensities and internal configurations, and natural resources). When possible, we used existing information to establish, or corroborate, conclusions. The preliminary findings are outlined below:

- **Project Boundaries:**

The Community Master Plan Committee, Vanasse & Daylor and the Lee County Department of Community Development established the project boundaries by comparing several existing documents that identify the Estero Community. These included the Estero Fire District, the Estero/San Carlos Planning Community, the Estero Census Tract, the Zip Code Districts and the Elementary School Boundaries.

The actual community boundaries are difficult to identify, except for the southern and western boundaries, which are established by the City of Bonita Springs and Estero Bay, respectively. No clear physical or developmental boundary can be used to separate Estero from San Carlos. In most instances, Koreshan Parkway is recognized as the demarcation line, but it is interesting to note that the Estero Chamber of Commerce and the Estero Fire District's Administrative Offices are north of this line.

Similarly, east of I-75, the north/south separation presents a challenge. The generally recognized line runs along the northern edge of Grand Oaks, which also corresponds to the northern boundary of the Corkscrew Road Service Area (CRSA). However, the University Window Overlay, Miramar Lakes, Florida Gulf Coast University's main entrance and the Teco Area all have a significant synergy with both the Estero and San Carlos Communities, particularly due to the role these areas will have in the future growth of the Estero Community.

To the east, the county line provides a clear boundary. However, the timing and nature of the development occurring several miles east of the Interstate will have minimal impact on the near term growth of Estero.


Perhaps most interesting, is the property located east of I-75, but south of Corkscrew Road. Much of this property is located in the Bonita Planning Community, or Bonita Fire District, but because of the boundaries established by Bonita Springs and the land acquisition to the south, this area appears to have a stronger relationship to Estero than to Bonita.

Because of the complexities associated with identifying the boundaries, and the limited scope of the initial phase of this Community Plan, we have prepared three exhibits. The first Exhibit shows the Study Area. This area includes land north of Grande Oaks on the east side of I-75. The purpose of this inclusion is not to "stake claim" to these areas, but rather to recognize the importance these areas will have on the future growth of both Estero and San Carlos. Ideally, by including these areas into the study area, there will be a more integrated approach in terms of landscaping, signage and provision of housing.

The second Exhibit (Exhibit 2) identifies the recommended boundaries of the Estero Community. This boundary essentially includes the Estero Fire District, with the exception of the addition of land south of Corkscrew Road that is currently shown in the Bonita Springs Fire District. Because the access to this area is limited to Corkscrew Road, and it is physically separated from the Town of Bonita Springs or the Bonita Beach Road area by public acquisition areas (CREW and SFWMD), it is recommended that this area be integrated into the Estero Planning Community.

Exhibit 3 was prepared to focus the attention on the more immediate issues through the designation of a "Core Community" area. The majority of the planning efforts for the First Lee Plan Amendment and initial round of Land Development Code amendments will focus on the Core Community area.


Exhibit 1: Study Area



NOTES

- 1.) ALICO INTERCHANG
CASE NOS. 85-11-1
- 2.) THREE OAKS/VILLA
CASE NOS. 81-1-1
- 3.) PELICAN LANDING

Exhibit 2: Community Boundaries



- NOTES**
- 1.) ALICO INTERCHANG
CASE NOS. 85-11-1
 - 2.) THREE OAKS/VILLA
CASE NOS. 81-1-1
 - 3.) PELICAN LANDING

- **Population:**

Based on an analysis of the approved dwelling units, county population projections, and a detailed count of existing homes prepared by the Estero Fire District, the existing and projected populations within the Estero Core Community, are as follows:

Table 1: 1999 Population Projections Based on Data and Analysis:

| | Dwelling Units | | | Population - | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|------------|
| | Total | Permanently Occupied | Seasonally Occupied | Permanent | Seasonal | Functional |
| Estero | 6,815 | 4,484 | 1,990 | 10,188 | 3,980 | 14,168 |

Source: Lee County Department of Community Development

DRAFT

Table 2: 2010 Population Projections Based on Housing Projections

| Year | Dwelling Units | Population |
|------|----------------|------------|
| 1999 | 7,089 | 14,745 |
| 2010 | 25,718 | 53,493 |

Source: Estero Fire Department

Table 3: 2020 Population Projections for the Estero/San Carlos Community

| Year | Population |
|-------|------------|
| 1998 | 23,240 |
| 2020* | 43,404 |

Source: Lee County Department of Community Development

Table 4: Community Expected Population by 2020:

| Answer | Average | Number of Answers | Multiplied |
|-------------------|---------|-------------------|------------|
| No Answer | | 27 | |
| 5,000 | 5,000 | 1 | 5,000 |
| 10,000 | 10,000 | 5 | 50,000 |
| 10,000 - 15,000 | 12,500 | 3 | 37,500 |
| 13,000 - 14,000 | 13,500 | 1 | 13,500 |
| 15,000 | 15,000 | 7 | 105,000 |
| 15,000 - 20,000 | 17,500 | 3 | 52,500 |
| 15,000 - 25,000 | 20,000 | 1 | 20,000 |
| 20,000 | 20,000 | 6 | 120,000 |
| 20,000 - 25,000 | 22,500 | 2 | 45,000 |
| 20,000 - 30,000 | 25,000 | 3 | 75,000 |
| 25,000 | 25,000 | 4 | 100,000 |
| 25,000 - 30,000 | 27,500 | 1 | 27,500 |
| 30,000 | 30,000 | 7 | 210,000 |
| 30,000 - 35,000 | 32,500 | 1 | 32,500 |
| 30,000 - 40,000 | 35,000 | 4 | 140,000 |
| 30,000 - 50,000 | 40,000 | 1 | 40,000 |
| 35,000 | 35,000 | 1 | 35,000 |
| 35,000 - 50,000 | 42,500 | 1 | 42,500 |
| 40,000 | 40,000 | 7 | 280,000 |
| 40,000 - 50,000 | 45,000 | 1 | 45,000 |
| 50,000 | 50,000 | 14 | 700,000 |
| 50,000 - 60,000 | 55,000 | 2 | 110,000 |
| 50,000 - 75,000 | 62,500 | 1 | 62,500 |
| 60,000 | 60,000 | 4 | 240,000 |
| 60,000 - 75,000 | 67,500 | 1 | 67,500 |
| 70,000 | 70,000 | 1 | 70,000 |
| 70,000 - 100,000 | 85,000 | 2 | 170,000 |
| 75,000 | 75,000 | 1 | 75,000 |
| 75,000 - 100,000 | 87,500 | 1 | 87,500 |
| 80,000 | 80,000 | 1 | 80,000 |
| 80,000 - 100,000 | 90,000 | 1 | 90,000 |
| 100,000 | 100,000 | 4 | 400,000 |
| 100,000 - 150,000 | 125,000 | 1 | 125,000 |

| | | | |
|---------------|--|------------|------------------|
| TOTALS | | 121 | 3,753,500 |
|---------------|--|------------|------------------|

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---------------|
| AVERAGE POPULATION ANSWER | | | 30,994 |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---------------|

It is interesting to note that based on the public input through the Estero Community Questionnaire, the mean population (as reflected in Table 2) of 30,994 is roughly consistent with the with the current projected population for the year 2010 established by a detailed analysis of existing and approved units.

- **Future Land Use Map:**

The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) within the Core Community has a center point at I-75 and Corkscrew Road. This point represents the highest intensity land uses and highest concentration of circulation corridors, with land uses, density and intensity reducing as you proceed away from this point. A second development node is identifiable at the intersection of US 41 and Corkscrew Road, where an existing community shopping center already exists. The Future Land Uses within the Estero Community are reflected on Exhibit 3.

The majority of the undeveloped land within the Core Community is designated "suburban", with surrounding existing and approved projects consuming the majority of the outlying suburban and/or rural designations. The "suburban" category allows for moderate residential densities, and limits commercial intensities to developments less than 100,000 square feet.

As depicted on the FLUM, the most dominant natural features are located east of I-75, or along the edges of Estero Bay. Three notable exceptions include the headwaters of the Estero River (which emanate from the northern edge of County Creek and run southwest), the Koreshan State Historic Site (located at the northwest quadrant of US 41 and Corkscrew Road) and a wetland flow way system that has been integrated into The Brooks water management/preserve system.

Generally, the existing designations are appropriate for guiding the future growth of the community, provided that Lee County gives further direction on where and how commercial uses should be developed, and a methodology to encourage a mix of residential uses and community uses in the smaller parcels along key corridors.

Based on these findings, we anticipate that Lee County could adopt a Community Overlay into the Lee Plan to provide this direction, without requiring a significant redesignation of the underlying Future Land Use Categories. The "Overlay" will initially be implemented through the proposed Goals, Objectives and Policies recommended in Phase I, while specific "Overlay" regulations may be adopted through Phase 2 and 3 of the Community Plan.


- **Planned Development Approvals:**

Much of the support for undertaking this amendment is generated out of frustration with, or a mis-understanding of the Planned Development Approval Process, or the entitlements obtained in earlier Planned Developments.

Based on input from the community, we have found that residents perceive that significant development has recently been approved for the community, outpacing the actual demand. Vanasse & Daylor, LLP conducted a thorough evaluation of all of the Planned Development Approvals that have been granted within the area identified above as the Estero Community, in order to determine what has actually been approved, and how that compares with the projected population. Based on a detailed review of the zoning resolutions and Planned Development Summary (which are provided in Appendix

B) Table 3 has been prepared to summarize the current residential, service and retail approvals granted through the Planned Development Process. It is important to note, that the date of each approval has also been provided.

Exhibit 4: Future Land Use Map



In Appendix A, we have summarized the planned development approvals in Estero. Appendix A shows that there is approximately 7,779,076 square feet of approved commercial entitlements, while there are 25,656 approved residential units. This results in a ratio of 303.2 square feet per dwelling unit. The original Roberts Overlay (2010 Overlay) estimated a commercial demand of .0323 acres (or 1,400 square feet) per dwelling unit for all of Lee County in 1987 and a projection of .0418 acres (or 1,800 square feet) per dwelling unit in the year 2010. Based on this evaluation, the approved commercial does not exceed the ratio established by the Lee Plan. This is not intended to suggest that all of the commercial is compatible with surrounding uses, or that it is appropriately located, but simply that based on the approved residential units, there is not an excess of commercial approved within the Estero Community.

Another source of frustration for residents has been the perceived uncertainty when projects are approved using a "bubble" Master Concept Plan (MCP). However, in reviewing a significant sample of the Master Concept Plans for community cores, most projects are adequately articulated to provide sufficient assurance for adjacent uses. Frequently it is not that the uses being developed differs from those requested, but residents simply would prefer to see other uses. Of course, there have been some notable exceptions to this conclusion, primarily in conjunction with several recent developments that approved intensive uses, which were not consistent with the community's expectations for commercial development within the community. In light of this conflict between adequate assurance for the community, and reasonable flexibility for the development community, this Community Plan recommends some additional restrictions on uses, as well as increased submittal requirements for specific "high intensity" uses. These recommendations are contained in the Recommendations Section of this report.


- **Natural Resources:**

In evaluating the public input provided through the Workshop Questionnaire, 45% of the respondents cited Water Resources as their primary concern, with a vast number of the remaining respondents identifying this as one of the top several issues. The main justification for this concern is the reoccurring restrictions implemented by the Water Management District, and the occurrence of dry wells in certain communities. It is important to note that the SFWMD has instituted water restrictions on a regular basis for nearly 20 years. The result is the perception that the restrictions are solely the result of new development, when in reality, they have been a regular occurrence for many years. This Community Plan recommends that Lee County work with the SFWMD to implement a year-round "Conservation Program" that encourages smart use of water resources, while eliminating the fear associated with period "restrictions" that are created, then lifted in an ongoing basis.

Second, one of the desired results of the Community Plan is to encourage Lee County Department of Public Works, Lee County Water Supply Authority and the South Florida Water Management District to begin an educational program to outline the actual status of potable water planning, treatment and availability in Lee County. Again, the perception is that the community is on the brink of running out of water supply, when in reality, the above mentioned agencies have established long term plans, adopted regulations to enforce those plans, and are continuing to work with private developers to undertake Aquifer Storage and Recovery Wells, restoration of flow ways, and long term protection of potable sources, etc. This Community Plan recognizes those efforts, as well as the understandable desire to protect these resources. Phase I includes provisions to encourage the implementation of existing regulations, as well as conduct additional evaluations during the Phase III amendments.

Finally, in reviewing the available documentation on other natural resources, primarily wetlands and Environmentally Significant Coastal Habitats, the Community Plan recommends adding an Environmental Objective to Goal 19 to help provide additional guidance for the protection of natural resources during the future growth of the Estero Community. This Objective will be primarily associated with the Estero River and Tributaries, as well as the "coastal fringe" associated with the Estero Bay. This recommendation is based on the mapping provided by the Agency on Bay Management, Exhibit 6, the CREW Regional Ecosystem Watershed Map, Exhibit 7, and the Regional Planning Council's Regionally Significant Natural Resources Map, Exhibit 8.

Exhibit 6: Agency On Bay Management




ADOPTED JULY 13, 1998 BY THE ESTERO BAY AGENCY ON BAY MANAGEMENT

**ESTERO BAY WATERSHED
LAND CONSERVATION/PRESERVATION STRATEGY MAP**

DRAFT

Exhibit 7: CREW Regional Ecosystem Watershed



(CREW)
CORKSCREW REGIONAL ECOSYSTEM WATERSHED

- **Transportation:**

One of the next highest "areas of concern", as identified by the residents of Estero, is the roadway/traffic issue. Because of the complex nature of this issue, it is recommended that Lee County continue to enforce the concurrency standards contained in the Lee Plan. However, it is further recommended that a detailed evaluation of the projected transportation requirements for approved and planned development be initiated as part of the Phase III evaluation.

Two specific issues that appear to be appropriate for additional evaluation are the extension of Sandy Lane south to Williams, and the identification of an additional east/west corridor. One east/west corridor that has been preliminarily evaluated is the Coconut Road extension to the proposed 951 extension. Currently, the Estero Community Plan makes no formal recommendation on any specific actions on these two issues, other than identifying that they deserve additional evaluation.

A third issue currently receiving a significant amount of attention is the truck traffic on Corkscrew Road. The community is strongly behind current efforts to designate Corkscrew Road as a "No Through Truck" zone, from Alico to US 41. Significant amount of research and documentation has been provided to Lee County through the on-going efforts of the Corkscrew Road Service Area (CRSA). Presently this issue is schedule to go before the Board of County Commissioners at the October Management and Planning Meeting. Additional recommendations are contained in this document to further support this community planning issue.

DRAFT

- **Historic Resources:**

The Koreshan Unity's settlement in Lee County was based in Estero, with the very first buildings located at the Estero River, adjacent to the current alignment of US 41. The settlement was established in 1894 as an outgrowth of the Koreshan Unity Movement. During the next decade, the Koreshan community continued to see significant cultural development and construction.

The main buildings and gardens of the original settlement were determined to be of such significance that they were placed on the National Register of Historic Places by the State of Florida. Eventually, Koreshan Unity, Inc donated the majority of the property to the state in 1961.

In December 1986, Lee County, in conjunction with Florida Preservation Services, prepared the Historic and Archaeological Survey – Lee County, to highlight the significance of the facility, as well as recommend specific planning considerations. The following information is taken from that report.

Description:

The Koreshan Unity settlement, now a state park, is available for study, interpretation, and recreation. The settlement area within the park is listed on the National Register. Most of the 11 buildings recorded in the survey were built prior to 1908 and reflect the industry and activities of the settlers.

The significant buildings include the Planetary Court, dormitory, Arts Hall, store, bakery and various residential buildings. Beyond the religious settlement are residential areas that were built between Sandy Lane, Corkscrew Road and Broadway, and include several old grove houses and outbuildings. Mound Key fishing families built many of these buildings in 1917 – 1918. Additionally, the old schools of 1917 and 1924 are standing, as is the old county barn. On the west side of US 41 is the Boomer estate and caretaker's house.

Significance:

The national register nomination form prepared by the Department of State, Division of Historic Resources in 1975 described the significance of the site as follows:

"The physical remains of the Koreshan community are preserved because they represent a unique philosophical and religious movement, because they illustrate a cooperative settlement of the past era and because they are remnants of a pioneer community which, in many ways, typified life on the south Florida frontier around the turn of the twentieth century. The extant gardens are of value to tropical horticulturalists."

Based on the findings contained in this Historical Survey, as well as the Community's desire to protect its historical beginnings, the Community Plan is recommending several specific actions in order to protect these assets and enhance the aesthetic value of the community.

First, a policy is being proposed in Phase I to encourage the protection of these historic areas by discouraging the conversion to retail or commercial uses that would eliminate the historic nature of the property. The intent is not to prohibit reasonable development within this area, but rather to encourage development that enhances the historic nature, and is consistent with the character of the community. Potential uses include studios, arts and craft facilities, corporate training facilities, retreats, and snack bars.

Second, it is recommended that a detailed master plan for the Historic Area be developed, and redevelopment/preservation incentives be adopted during Phase II of the Community Plan. This will provide assurances of realistic development potential, as well as guide appropriate growth in the Highlands Avenue corridor.

Finally, it is recommended that Phase III of the Community Plan obtain the necessary data and analysis to adopt a Historic Development Overlay into the Lee Plan.

Exhibit 9: Historic Areas Map:

DRAFT

3. Public Input:

Because of the grass roots nature of this undertaking, input from area residents and landowners has been very important in the formulation of the study's recommendations. In order to assist the community to maintain a focused approach for this first amendment round, we utilized the list of Key Community Issues, and the preliminary existing conditions evaluations to stimulate input. However, we received input on other issues, and will incorporate them throughout the community planning process.

Between August 15 and September 11, we provided over 500 copies of the questionnaire to the community. These were handed out at the first public workshop, made available through local points of service (Publix, Colonial Bank, and the Estero Chamber of Commerce), and many were mailed out or sent via e-mail to those calling to request additional copies.

As of September 11, we received 125 responses to the questionnaire.

4. Planning Workshops

In addition, 4 Planning Workshops were conducted with the Estero Community Plan Committee in order to establish a scope, evaluate project approaches, review preliminary findings, and critique the preliminary draft of the Estero Community Plan. These meetings were fairly informal, and were conducted at the Colonial Bank conference room. Additional informal meetings were conducted with various members of the Committee, either by phone or at the offices of Vanasse & Daylor, LLP.

These workshops provided the members of the committee with a better understanding of the community input, results of the mapping, and recommended approach. Further, they provided the Consultant with the opportunity to obtain input from representatives of the Community and refine the Plan recommendations.

Section Four: Community Direction/Evaluation of Public Input

In order to solicit direct input from the community and Key Stakeholders, Vanasse & Daylor prepared a Questionnaire to identify specific concerns, recommendations and comments held by the citizens. These questionnaires contained a very broad diversity in response ranging from a no-growth sentiment to a "maintain the course" recommendation. Presented below is a summary of some of the key responses to the questionnaire. Copies of all the questionnaires are attached in Appendix B.

Table # 5:

FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The question read:

DRAFT

Please rank the following public facilities and services based on your perception of the relative need for improvement.

| RANKING | | No Answer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | TOTALS |
|---------|----------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--------|
| 2 | ROADS | 16 | 40 | 16 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | 125 |
| 11 | BIKE PATHS | 19 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 5 | 125 |
| 1 | WATER SUPPLY | 19 | 58 | 22 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 125 |
| 3 | DRAINAGE | 19 | 17 | 28 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 125 |
| 8 | SOLID WASTE | 22 | 8 | 5 | 18 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 125 |
| 9 | PARKS AND RECREATION | 22 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 5 | | 125 |
| 4 | FIRE PROTECTION | 23 | 10 | 11 | 19 | 12 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | 125 |
| 10 | LIBRARY | 29 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 125 |
| 6 | EDUCATION | 23 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 4 | | 125 |
| 12 | CULTURE | 22 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 5 | | 125 |
| 13 | RELIGION | 29 | 1 | 1 | | 8 | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 20 | 8 | 125 |
| 5 | LAW ENFORCEMENT | 23 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 125 |
| 7 | HEALTH CARE | 22 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 125 |
| | TOTALS | | 288 | 180 | 113 | 110 | 105 | 120 | 93 | 101 | 91 | 81 | 95 | 78 | 76 | 67 | 27 |

(Please note: Not all rankings were used in all answers, some rankings were used more than once per questionnaire.)

Based on the compilation of responses, evaluation of existing conditions, and mapping and analysis, a Community Vision was refined, as well as the identification of multiple "Action Items". These Action Items represent general or specific steps that the community has identified for immediate action or future detailed evaluation. Presented below is a summary of the key issues identified by the participants of the study. However, in order to give the Community a clear expectation of how each of these Action Items will be addressed, when they will be addressed, and who is responsible for implementing them, each Action Item has been categorized in one of the following five categories:

- Initial Lee Plan Amendment
- Land Development Code Amendment
- Detailed Master Planning
- Secondary Lee Plan Amendments
- Community Responsibility

1. Initial Lee Plan Amendment:

The Action Items listed in this category can be addressed, even if only preliminarily, in the Lee Plan Amendment scheduled for submittal on September 29, 2000. These are typically issues that are visionary in nature, and can be adopted in Goal, Objective and Policy format. They will then serve as "enabling" language for future, more detailed community planning efforts.

These Action Items will help form the Community Vision Statement, and will serve as the cornerstone for future development and project approvals.

Timeframe: Initiated September 29, 2000; Approved September 2001

a. Commercial Corridor Concepts – See Policy 19.2

- Encourage Retail Concentrations at Major Intersections and in Other Clusters
- Encourage Mixed Use Developments along designated roadways
- Encourage neighborhood oriented retail uses along designated roadways (such as Flower Shop, Shoe Repair, Art Gallery, etc.)

b. Recreational Areas and Parks – See Recommended Policy 19.4

- Encourage the continued development of Recreational opportunities
- Encourage the integration of recreational opportunities and public water access on the Sahdev property.
- Encourage the acquisition of public access to the Estero River
- Encourage continued preservation and enhancement of CREW Lands

c. Community Services/Infrastructure

- Encourage Local Governmental Offices For Essential Services in Estero
- Encourage a Sheriff's Substation in Estero
- Encourage enhanced Fire Protection and EMS/ALS Services for Estero
- Encourage Community Based Medical/Health Services in Estero
- Encourage the expansion of Lee Tran Operations within Estero
- Discourage the proliferation of median cuts and accesses to adjacent properties.
- Discourage Through Truck Traffic on Corkscrew Road
- Provide direction for the protection of the Historic resources of Estero.

d. Environmental/Protection of Natural Resources

- Direct Required Mitigation to Estero, Whenever Possible

e. Identify Incompatible Uses

- Discourage the approval of detrimental uses including adult entertainment related businesses, bottle club establishments, free standing bars or lounges, businesses that use large outdoor areas for sales and inventory storage.

f. Development Approval Process

- Provide for earlier public notification of zoning actions via on-site signage, notice in the media, notice on County website, and notice to registered organizations and citizens of application for rezoning.
- Encourage Public Workshops Prior to the Hearings Examiner Proceedings.

g. General Amendments

- Update the Vision Statement to reflect the Community Vision for Estero

2. Land Development Code Amendment:

The following Action Items are typically more detailed in nature, and applicable to all new development in the Estero Community. These items will not only apply to all new development, but to approved projects that have not obtained Development Orders. Because of the specific nature of these amendments, these Action Items will be adopted in the Land Development Code, and will have the most immediate and visible results in achieving the character the community desires. Examples of these Action Items include buffering, enhanced landscaping, signage guidelines, etc.

Timeframe: Initiated October 2000; Approved January 2001

a. Architectural Standards for Structures

- Establish a Community Based Architectural Standards Review Board
- Define Standards Compatible with Community Vision
- Include or modify Building Height Limits
- Include or modify Building Setback Standards
- Encourage "Subdued" Color Schemes
- Limit "Box Type" Structures Without Architectural Features and Trim (these regulations currently exist in the Land Development Code, but may require refinement for Estero.)

b. Landscaping Standards

- Require Landscaping Consistent with LeeScape Master Plan
- Establish Standardized "Welcome to Estero" Signs and Landscaping at Estero Borders
- Require Implementation of roadway landscaping, berms and Sidewalks/Bike Paths along designated road corridors in order to provide visual relief and a unifying element throughout the Community.

c. Lighting, Signs, Utilities, Towers and Antennas

- Establish Distinctive Street Signs, Lamps and Poles, Benches and Bus Shelters for use within the Community.

- Define Standards for Size, Placement and general design of Streetlights.
- Require (When Economically Feasible) Buried Utilities Along Gateway Roadways and Internal to Planned Developments
- Require Enhanced Landscaping/Screening Around Utilities

d. Commercial Corridor Concepts

- Establish or modify Building Setbacks in Conjunction with Rear Parking
- Limit the Number of Roadway Median Cross Cuts and Accesses from Roadways
- Evaluate modified Hours of Operations for areas adjacent to residential zones
- Evaluate requiring compliance with the Estero Community Plan provisions in order to extend or vest a Planned Development Master Plan after five years of inactivity.

f. Community Services

- Encourage Community Uses (Fire, Post Office, etc.) within all zoning districts in Estero.
- Provide incentives for redevelopment/preservation within the Historic Area.

g. Environmental/Protection of Natural Resources

- Encourage required mitigation within Estero, whenever possible
- Establish appropriate setback standards from the Estero River and Estero Bay

h. List of Undesirable Businesses

- Modify the "List of Permitted Uses" within Key Corridors to discourage detrimental uses, bottle clubs, free standing bar or lounges, businesses which require large outdoor areas for sales and inventory storage

i. Development Approval Process

- Outline a Public Notification System to provide earlier public notice through signage, media, website notification or disclosure to Registered Organizations.
- Establish appropriate levels of information for Master Concept Plans – based on whether or not the proposed use is a "High Impact" use.
- Require an additional opportunity for Community review and input on a development approval request, prior to the Hearing Examiner Process.

3. Detailed Master Planning:

These Action Items will typically require additional research and/or detailed site planning on specific parcels. Examples include the location and/or design of community facilities such as parks, post offices, band shells, etc. This work must be directed by a consensus of the Estero Community, and in concert with individual property owners.

Timeframe: Initiated At the request of the Community Planning Committee
Approved by the Community Planning Committee and Private Property Owner

- Investigate potential Village Green concepts in conjunction with the Sandy Lane, Estero Community Park, and Railroad area.
- Investigate the potential of a modified "Main street" concept for the property adjacent to Corkscrew Road.

- c. Prepare conceptual and detailed "Entry Features" to welcome travelers to the Estero Gateways.
- d. Prepare conceptual and detailed plans for Koreshan State Historic Site's US 41 frontage. This may include enhanced landscaping, informational/interpretive kiosk at US 41 and Corkscrew intersection, modified wall and column design to integrate the Park into the community.
- e. Prepare conceptual and detailed plans for the Theatre in the Woods property at the Northeast quadrant of US 41 and Corkscrew Road to identify potential development scenarios that maintain the historic/open space nature of the property, while potentially allowing some development that is consistent with the Vision Plan.
- f. Prepare a Historic Community plan for the Broadway and Highland Road area. This may include residential, limited office and studio type uses.

4. Secondary Lee Plan Amendments:

These are more specific community planning elements that require significant evaluation, public input, and investigation of economic impacts. Because of the limited timeframe for the initial amendment, a secondary amendment round may be required to further implement specific modifications to the maps and/or text of the Lee Plan.

Timeframe: Initiated at the request of the Community Planning Committee
 Submitted September 2001
 Approved September 2002

- a. **Commercial Corridor Concepts**
 - Designate Specific Locations for "high intensity" commercial uses – not solely based on square footage.
 - Designate Specific Areas for Mixed Use Village Uses (Corkscrew Road, Highland Road)
 - Designate Future Community Facilities Location
- b. **Recreational Areas and Parks**
 - Evaluate the "Desired" LOS Requirements for Recreational Facilities in Estero
- c. **Community Services**
 - Evaluate the 2020 MPO Traffic ways maps for necessary improvements
 - Identify Sites for New Schools and Community Based Educational Programs in Estero.
 - Develop a Historic Development Overlay for the Historic Area east of US 41 and the Koreshan State Historic Site.
- d. **Environmental/Protection of Natural Resources**
 - Confine Required Mitigation to Estero, whenever possible
 - Evaluate the Preservation Approach within the DRGR areas East of I-75

e. General Amendments:

- Update the Planning Communities Map to individually track the population and development approvals within Planning Community 13.

5. Community Responsibility:

These are undertakings that do not fall within the "jurisdiction" of local regulatory structure. These Action items are identified in this report, but will require the active involvement of the Community to implement.

a. Architectural Standards for Structures

- Define Standards Compatible with Florida Traditional Styles and Surroundings.

While this was clearly a sentiment established in the Questionnaire responses, it is not recommended that a single style be established as the "preferred" style for the community. Rather, it is recommended that the Community work together during the Land Development Code amendments to identify certain parameters that are desired in the community, but allow various styles to be implemented. This approach will be much easier to regulate, will allow for more diversity, and result in a more vibrant, attractive community.

- Encourage "Subdued" Color Schemes.

As with the architectural regulations mandating a specific style, limitations on colors may be very difficult to obtain a consensus on, as well as regulate. It is recommended that a preferred list of colors be established during the Land Development Code process, with the understanding that the community will have to provide direct input to the developer during the Community workshops.

b. Landscaping Standards

- Use "Signature" Plantings of Flowering Plants and Trees.

It is understood that the Community desires an attractive landscaping component to separate the Estero Community from other areas of Lee County. However, it is the recommendation of this consultant that the landscaping not be limited to flowering plants and trees. Often, these plant species require significant maintenance, have undesired leaf and fruit drop, and go dormant during the peak season. Conversely, it is recommended that the majority of "required" plant material be based around native, hardy plant material with minimal maintenance requirements. Additional landscaping may be provided at the discretion of the property owner that features a limited list of flowering plant species.

c. Recreational Areas and Parks

- Develop Youth/Adult Recreation Centers with Active Programs

Typically, this type of requirement is community based, either through the establishment of a MSBU/MSTU district to fund these additional recreational facilities, or through the development of programs in conjunction with a YMCA, church or other similar organization.

- Make Appropriate Use of The Sahdev Property.

While a Policy has been recommended to encourage the "appropriate use" of the Sahdev Property, it is important to inform the Community that this is a State owned and managed facility, and that Lee County has no ability to require or develop any specific type of development at this location.

d. Cultural and Historical

- Support The Estero Historical Society, the Koreshan State Historic Site and Facilities Restoration, and develop a Center for the Arts.

All of these desires are efforts that must be undertaken by the residents and Key Stakeholders of the Community. Lee County has no ability to mandate or affect any change that would result in the achievement of these goals.

e. Community Services

- Establish local governmental offices for essential services in Estero.

The Estero Community Plan includes a Policy encouraging the compliance with this goal. However, the realization of this goal will require significant lobbying and population growth in order to justify this level of infrastructure. Most likely, in order for these services to be provided, there will have to be a public/private partnership to facilitate the cost effective provision of these services. It is recommended that the Community work with local developers and landowners to put together an offering that will encourage the County government to take action on this request.

- Identify Sites for New Schools and Community Based Educational Programs in Estero.

The Lee County School Board, as well as higher educational providers, is completely independent of Lee County government. While Policies may be developed to encourage these uses, the County has no ability to implement this goal. In order to realize compliance with this goal, a local effort will have to be spearheaded by the Community to persuade the appropriate agencies to consider locating in the Estero Community.

- Encourage Community Based Medical/Health Services in Estero.

The provision of Medical and Health services are purely market driven, and cannot be required to locate in the Estero Community. As with other "Community Cultural" elements, it is recommended that the Community put together a group that is charged with the responsibility of pursuing these service providers, and demonstrating that Estero is the most appropriate location for them to enter the market.

f. Environmental/Protection of Natural Resources

- Enforce Population Density Standards.

The Lee Plan establishes the maximum density standards. There are no instances where the population standards have not been enforced. There may be instances where zoning approvals allow densities consistent with the higher end of the permitted densities, but the resulting density is consistent with the established standards.

- Define and Implement Noise Standards.

Lee County already has a Noise Ordinance that establishes maximum noise thresholds for daytime and nighttime periods. This Ordinance is enforced by the Lee County Sheriff's office. A recent evaluation of this ordinance demonstrates that the regulations are consistent with the majority of Florida communities.

g. Development Approval Process

- Conduct all Public Workshops and Hearings Within the Estero Community.

This request would essentially relocate the county seat to Estero. It is highly unlikely that all Public Workshops and Hearings could be conducted within the Community. The Estero Community Plan has recommended additional notification and workshops be conducted within the community, but additional changes should be conducted separate from the Community Plan.

- Distinguish between "persons being paid to influence public decisions" and "citizens and/or citizens organizations" when limiting communications with County Staff and County Commissioners regarding property and land use decisions.

This request is based on the current prohibition of un-authorized communication with County Commissioners. This is a legal issue that has recently been discussed between the Board of County Commissioners and the County Attorney's Office. The Community Plan has no ability to modify this current regulation. If the Community desires additional changes, it is recommended that the issue be addressed with the State Attorney's office as well as the County Attorney's office.

Section 5: Concepts/Strategies

The following concepts are underlying principals that have been utilized to evaluate the Action Items, as well as craft the Estero Community Plan recommendations. These concepts are founded in sound planning principles, Lee Plan provisions, and Land Development Code regulations, and are intended to maintain a balance between the desires of the community and the legal rights of property owners.

1. The unique character of Estero should be enhanced and/or protected from visual blight.
2. Corkscrew Road is a gateway into the Estero Community, and should be protected.
3. Florida Gulf Coast University and the International Airport should be considered when planning for future growth patterns within the Estero Community.
4. The historic beginnings of Estero should be protected and integrated into the Community.
5. The natural resources of Estero are essential for the well being of the Community.
6. Acknowledge and protect property rights previously obtained through the development approval process.
7. The following Lee Plan provisions are particularly applicable to the Estero Community, and should be considered in all land use or infrastructure planning decisions.

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. Goal 1: | Future Land Use Categories |
| b. Objective 2.1: | Development Location |
| c. Objective 2.2: | Development Timing |
| d. Policy 2.3.2: | Provision of Adequate Infrastructure |
| e. Policy 2.9.1: | Scenic Corridors |
| f. Goal 4: | Development Design (encouraging Mixed Use Projects) |
| g. Policy 5.1.3: | Direct high-density residential areas to locations near employment centers. |
| h. Policy 5.1.5: | Protection of the character and integrity of existing and future residential areas from encroachment of destructive uses. |
| i. Policy 6.1.1: | Review criteria for Commercial Development. |
| j. Policy 6.1.3: | Commercial Development Design Requirements |
| k. Policy 6.1.5: | Traffic Carrying Capacity provisions (to support the requirement to provide project interconnects along Corkscrew Road). |
| l. Policy 6.1.11: | Incentives for the Conversion of Strip Commercial Uses. (this provision may be implemented to support recommendations resulting from the Phase II and III Estero Community Plan). |
| m. Goal 22: | Level of Service Requirements for the County Road system. |
| n. Goal 24: | Transportation System Development Regulations |
| o. Objective 25.3: | Roadway Landscaping (use this Objective to support enhanced landscaping requirements) |
| p. Goal 33: | Potable Water Level of Service Requirements |
| q. Goal 36: | Sanitary Sewer Level of Service Requirements |
| r. Goal 41: | Protection of Water Resources (to educate the Community on existing efforts to protect these resources) |

- s. Goal 43: Groundwater Recharge (to educate the Community on existing efforts to protect these resources)
- t. Chapter V.: Parks, Recreation and Open Space (to support requests for integrated planning of recreational facilities)
- u. Policy 70.1.3: Minimum Acceptable Level of Service Standards
- v. Goal 74: Coastal Resource Protection (to support future additional regulations associated with the Coastal Area)
- w. Goal 77: Resource Protection (to support future Land Development Code amendments that may require additional protection of key natural resources)
- x. Objective 104.3: Historic Preservation Incentives (to support recommendations regarding the enhancement of the Koreshan State Historic Site and Theatre in the Woods property).
- y. Policy 110.1.2: Economic Element (used to support request for additional medical facilities within the community)

DRAFT

Section Six: Recommendations

The recommendations from Phase I of the Estero Community Plan are targeted at establishing a vision for the community, and to provide the Lee Plan with guidance for future community development issues within Estero. The proposed Lee Plan amendments fall into six primary categories: Community Character, Commercial Land Use, Residential Land Use, Natural Resources, the Development Approval Process, and Community Facilities. Presented below are the proposed Goals, Objectives and Policies intended to begin to establish the type of community envisioned by the residents.

Vision Statement:

"To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. Lee County shall establish, enhance and enforce regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2001, Lee County shall review, amend or establish Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering and shading of parking areas, signage consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County may not approve any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work with private property owners to establish incentives for bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: Lee County and the Estero Community shall work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish a town commons that encourages the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities. Ideally,

this town commons shall be located south of Corkscrew Road and north of The Brooks, and shall be between US 41 and I-75.

Policy 19.1.5: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to enhance the Koreshan State Historic Site in such a manner that it is more visually integrated with the Community along US 41, provides for enhanced pedestrian/bicycle access, and includes a public plaza/interpretive area at the corner of US 41 and Corkscrew Road.

Policy 19.1.5: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the property owners within the Historic Area to encourage development that is consistent with the historic nature of the Highlands Avenue/US 41 area. This should include the prohibition of significant conversion of land area until a comprehensive Historic Development Overlay can be developed.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future county regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that tasteful shopping and employment opportunities are provided, while maintaining the community character.

Policy 19.2.1: All commercial developments within the Estero Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses shall be in compliance with the Retail Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" (when not offered as part of an area wide development plan) may not be permitted along Corkscrew Road or adjacent to any residential use.

Policy 19.2.3: Non-Residential Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are encouraged to be mixed use in nature, and allow for residential uses when possible. Further, uses outside of the Site Location Nodes on Corkscrew Road should be limited to minor commercial uses intended to serve community residents.

Policy 19.2.4: By the end of 2001, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that encourage or incentivize mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road.

Policy 19.2.5: With the exception of Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, as may be amended from time to time, Lee County shall discourage retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of service and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.6: By the end of 2001, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that prohibit "detrimental uses", free-standing nightclubs or lounges, or retail uses that require significant outdoor display, storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

Policy 19.2.7: By the end of 2001, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that require Planned Developments which exceed the five year time frame established in the Land Development Code, and have not complied with the vesting requirements outlined in the LDC, to automatically become vacated. In order to extend, vest or

otherwise maintain the original Master Concept Plan, all provisions required by Goal 19 shall be accommodated by the development.

Policy 19.2.8: By the end of 2001, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that require commercial developments within the Estero Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County shall protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County shall encourage higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, and along I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2001, Lee County shall amend the Mixed Planned Development Category to allow for small scale mixed use projects along Corkscrew Road, to allow residential above or in close proximity to retail and service uses.

Policy 19.3.3: By the end of 2001, Lee County shall review, amend or adopt regulations to strengthen buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.4: Lee County shall protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, or the placement of transitional density units along the perimeter.

Policy 19.3.5: No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2001, Lee County shall review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries shall include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide a 50' vegetative buffer adjacent to the top of bank. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County shall encourage the off-site mitigation of indigenous areas, wetland impacts or wildlife habitat impacts to be provided within the Estero Community Boundaries.

- Lee County shall provide significant incentives (increased density, impact fee reductions, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resource within the Estero Community.

Policy 19.4.2: Lee County shall focus acquisition efforts on environmentally sensitive lands east of I-75 and along the Estero Bay.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce Wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County shall encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions.

Policy 19.5.1: Lee County shall register groups within the Estero Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, development code amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates.

Policy 19.5.2: Lee County shall require public notice to any "registered" person or landowner within 500', issued upon being found sufficient.

Policy 19.5.3: Lee County shall establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available.

Policy 19.5.4: Lee County shall require that the agent for any planned development request within the Estero Community, conduct one public workshop, or provide one set of submittal information to an established "document clearing house" for public review. The agent shall provide the public workshop or submittal of documentation at least one week prior to the Hearing Examiner meeting.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County shall work with the Estero Community to economically provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities necessary to support the Estero Community as a vibrant urban core.

Policy 19.6.1: Lee County and the Estero Community shall work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Sahdev Property, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, attractive fence/walls along US 41, the provision of a "gateway" at US 41 and Corkscrew Road and enhanced pedestrian access.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will adopt regulations that will encourage the protection of historic or culturally significant areas from conversion to residential or commercial uses. This is not intended to prevent ancillary development designed to highlight historic uses, but rather to prohibit the removal of such historic uses.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.5: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

Policy 19.6.6: Lee County will assist the Estero Community in identifying and developing a "village green" that provides opportunities for public gathering, recreation, civic activities, and the distribution of public services, including a post office, license bureau, tax collectors office, police sub-station and or fire station.

Policy 19.6.7: Lee County will work with the Community and specific property owners to evaluate the potential of extending Sandy Land to Williams Avenue to provide for an alternative north/south corridor.

Policy 19.6.7: In order to protect the health, safety, welfare and community character, prohibit trucks with a carrying capacity of ## from using Corkscrew Road (from Alice Road to US 41) as a connecting road to US 41 and I-75.

Modifications to current Lee Plan Provisions:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as a mixed use development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions of the Corkscrew Road Mixed Use Village, retail uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan and approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

Vision Statement: Amend the Vision Statement to reflect the Vision Statement developed for the Estero Community.

DRAFT

Proposed Actions for Phase II of the Estero Community Plan:

As a result of the Action Items identified during the Phase I Community Planning Effort, several steps are recommended to the Community for incorporation of the Phase II Community Planning Effort. These include the following:

1. Evaluate and/or Modify Land Development Code Section 10-416, to consider enhanced landscape requirements for the Estero Community, particularly adjacent to identified road corridors, and between commercial and residential developments.
2. Evaluate and/or Modify Article IV of the Land Development Code to consider enhanced architectural requirements for the Estero Community.
3. Evaluate and/or Modify Chapter 30 of the Land Development Code to provide additional design guidelines for signage within the Estero Community.
4. Evaluate and/or Modify Division 7 of Chapter 34 to provide for enhanced notification of pending development approval hearings, as well as establish a methodology to provide greater information to the public prior to public hearings.
5. Evaluate and/or Modify Section 34-373(a)(6) of the Land Development Code to establish additional submittal requirements for specific land uses.
6. Clarify Section 34-341 of the Land Development Code to require that all commercial developments within the Estero Community be evaluated through the Planned Development process.
7. Evaluate Table 34-934 of the Land Development Code to establish that certain detrimental uses, or uses with significant outdoor storage are discouraged within the Estero Community except at locations currently designated on Map 19 of the Lee Plan.
8. Work with affected property owners to prepare and adopt specific development regulations for the Corkscrew Road Mixed Use Village that allow for mixed use developments in excess of Minor Commercial Standards, provided that the development complies with the limited list of permitted uses, more restrictive signage requirements, enhanced landscape standards, internal vehicular interconnections, and modified buffer and setback provisions.
9. Work with affected property owners to prepare and adopt specific development regulations for the Historic Village Development Areas to outline development regulations that encourage community oriented development while preserving historic and natural resources.

Proposed Actions for Phase III of the Estero Community Plan:

As a result of the Action Items identified during the Phase I Community Planning Effort, several steps are recommended to the Community for incorporation of the Phase III Community Planning Effort. Phase III will result in a combination of Map and Text Amendments to the Lee Plan to further the intent of the Estero Community Plan. These include the following:

2. Adopt a Historic Development Overlay for the historic corridor between US 41 and the Highland Avenue area.
3. Evaluate the potential of extending Sandy Lane to Williams Avenue, and the potential creation of an additional east/west connection road.
4. Prepare the necessary data and analysis to adopt a mixed use Village Overlay district along Corkscrew Road.
5. Evaluate the preservation strategies for targeted acquisition areas east of I-75.

DRAFT

Appendix A: Planned Development Approval Summary

DRAFT

Appendix B: Questionnaire Responses

DRAFT

General

1. What general area do you consider to be your neighborhood?

2. What do you envision Estero to look like in 2010? What character do you want it to have?

3. Given the current year-round population of approximately 5,000, how big do you see the Estero Community in 20 years?

Character

4. Would you support changes to the existing signage regulation? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

5. Would you support changes to the landscaping regulations? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

6. Would you support changes to architectural requirements? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

Land Use - Residential

7. Are there areas of the Estero community that you think should be identified for higher density uses?

8. Are there areas that of the Estero community that you think should be identified for lower density uses?

Land Use - Commercial

9. Are there areas of the Estero community that you think should be identified for higher intensity uses?

10. Are there areas that of the Estero community that you think should be identified for lower intensity uses?

11. Are there any specific commercial uses you would like to encourage or discourage within the Community?

Other

12. What, if anything, would you like to see changed in the Estero community?

13. Have you ever participated in a public hearing or zoning process? Yes _____ No _____ Would you recommend any changes?

14. Are there any other issues that you think ought to be addressed?
as we proceed with the Estero Community Plan?

15. What issues do you feel are important relative to past growth?

16. What issues do you feel are important relative to future growth?

17. Are there any other recommendations on land use that you
want to offer?

18. Please identify any problems or opportunities with specific
natural resources that you would like addressed.

Facilities and Services

19. Please rank the following public facilities and services based
on your perception of the relative need for improvement.

| Rank Importance (1 most to 14 least) | Facility/Service | Comment |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|
| | Roads | |
| | Bike Paths | |
| | Water Supply | |
| | Drainage | |
| | Solid Waste | |
| | Parks and Recreation | |
| | Fire Protection | |
| | Library | |
| | Education | |
| | Culture | |
| | Religion | |
| | Law Enforcement | |
| | Health Care | |

Estero Community Plan

Public Workshop #1 Questionnaire

August 15, 2000

Vanasse & Daylor is working in cooperation with the **Estero Chamber of Commerce**, the **Estero Concerned Citizens Association**, the **Estero Civic Association**, and the **Residents of Estero** to develop a Community Plan for the Estero Community. The Community Plan will address issues relating to land use, public facilities and services, natural resources and housing. This questionnaire is intended to gather an initial indication of the interests and priorities of the residents of the Estero Community.

Please complete the questionnaire and mail it to Vanasse & Daylor, LLP at the address listed below, or drop it by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, by August 23, 2000.

Mail the questionnaire to:
Diane Wakeman, Administrative Coordinator
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
12730 New Brittany Boulevard, Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907
(941) 437-4601



**PLANNING DIVISION**

M E M O R A N D U M

LEE COUNTY
S O U T H W E S T F L O R I D A

to: Mitch Hutchcraft, Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
from: Paul O'^{ROC}Connor, AICP, Director of Planning
subject: Estero Community Plan Comments
date: April 18, 2001

The Lee County Planning Division has reviewed the draft submittal for the Estero Community Plan, and offers the following comments. County staff met with members of the community and you in November of 2000, and discussed many of the following comments at that time. Staff had hoped that several of these issues would have been resolved by now, but they have not.

The goals, objectives, policies, and standards proposed by the Estero community have been proposed with the idea of incorporating these standards into the existing Lee Plan. Consequently, any such modification to the Lee Plan requires data and analysis (justification) in support of the amendment. The analysis should demonstrate that existing regulations have been reviewed, and that they are not adequate to meet the goals of the community. Also, the analysis should demonstrate that proposed regulations do not conflict with existing regulations. Staff analyzed this submittal as it would any other proposed plan amendment. In the review of the Estero Community Plan, staff primarily looked for data, analysis, and justification to support what was being proposed. Sufficient analysis for many of the proposals is missing from the current submittal. There are many regulations being proposed that would seem to be beneficial to the Estero community, but without adequate analysis, it is difficult to justify incorporating these policies into the Lee Plan.

Furthermore, some of the proposed regulations require some type of action by Lee County. Many of the policies require Lee County to amend certain documents, work with the Estero community, or provide something to the Estero community. These policies, in many cases, go above and beyond what is required in other areas of the County. In many cases, the new regulations will likely require additional capital expenditure beyond the County's existing level of service. The Estero Community Plan does not take into account how the County will pay for the additional level of service that would be required by some of the proposed policies. This issue needs to be addressed in the resubmittal. Additionally, several Policies require that the County's Land Development Code be amended by 2001. Staff notes that this is impossible as the last round of amendments for 2001 has already been initiated.

Specific comments on the proposed regulations are shown policy by policy, in numerical order, in the ensuing paragraphs.

Proposed Lee Plan Policies:

Vision Statement - The proposed Vision Statement seems to indicate that changes are being proposed to the Lee Plan's Vision Statement to reflect the unique character of Estero. Staff is unclear whether this means that Estero is requesting to be its own planning community, independent of the current "San Carlos/Estero" designation, or if the proposed vision statement language would be added to the existing San Carlos/Estero Vision Statement. The County uses the existing planning communities in the planning process for generating land use accommodation data. If the proposed amendments seek to establish a new planning community for Estero, then the Lee Plan 2020 allocations contained in Table 1(b) will also require an amendment.

The use of the phrase "certain undesired commercial uses" in the proposed Vision Statement needs further definition. As it currently reads, there is no guidance as to what constitutes an undesired commercial use. Staff questions the appropriateness of such language in the Vision Statement. This statement should be more general in nature, with any detailed restrictions on "undesired commercial uses" being addressed through specific policies. Staff believes that "undesired commercial uses" can be controlled through other policies that address compatibility, buffering, landscaping, etc.

Goal 19 - The phrase "approval process" should possibly be replaced by "review process." This is just a simple wording issue. The phrase "approval process" assumes that all development applications are approved, which they are not.

Policy 19.1.1 - The "draft" community plan gives little direction on what constitutes enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering and shading of parking areas, signage consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards. This proposed policy directs the County to amend the County's Land Development Code (LDC), but provides little or no direction as to how much the LDC should be amended. The balance of the community plan provides no further enlightenment.

Policy 19.1.2 - It is not realistic to eliminate all of these deviations. There will always be cases where a deviation is needed for a legitimate reason such as an unusual lot configuration. The LDC contains specific restrictions on the granting of deviations in Chapter 10-104(b). These restrictions prohibit deviations from being granted unless they are consistent with the Lee Plan, among other things. Staff needs to see more analysis indicating that alternatives have been considered, and that this new policy is the appropriate vehicle for achieving the desired outcome. Perhaps the policy could be rewritten to discourage these deviations by requiring a higher level of justification by the applicant.

Policy 19.1.3 - Staff questions what action would trigger the requirement to upgrade the aforementioned private property owner's development? The LDC already requires that properties that have been vacant for more than a year to be brought up to the code requirements as much as possible. Staff regularly works with owners in this situation.

Policy 19.1.4 - Staff needs to see analysis and reasoning why this particular location has been chosen for the town commons, and if it is feasible to locate it in this area. Why has this area been chosen as the desired location for the town commons? Would any existing development prevent the establishment of a town commons at this location? Would the town commons require any public funding or would it be a private development? Have other areas been considered? What level of involvement is expected from the County?

Policy 19.1.5 (first one numbered 19.1.5) - What level of County commitment is expected? What does "more visually integrated with the Community along US 41" mean? The Department of Environmental Protection Park Manager comments that the "creation of a public plaza/interpretive area for vehicular access would be difficult with the congestion, noise and traffic levels that currently exist. Safety concerns at the junction of US Highway 41 and Corkscrew Road would present serious drawbacks." The park manager notes that pedestrian/bicycle access to the park for US 41 is desperately needed.

Policy 19.1.5 (second one numbered 19.1.5) - Staff believes it would be most appropriate to revise this policy to say that the Lee Plan will be amended by a specific date to include a comprehensive "Historic Development Overlay." What are the boundaries of the "Historic Area"? Will it be the County's responsibility to develop the "Historic Development Overlay?"

Objective 19.2 - The phrase "tasteful shopping and employment opportunities" is subjective. Individual preferences can determine what is tasteful, in other words, tastes vary from individual to individual. The objective also assumes that there is an agreed upon "community character." What is the character that is to be maintained?

Policy 19.2.1 - This policy is unclear. Does this mean that all commercial development requiring rezoning must rezone to CPD? Or does it mean that all commercial development will be reviewed as if it were a CPD? It is not realistic to require all commercial developments to come in as a commercial planned development, when there are many vacant properties that already have conventional commercial zoning. What does this policy mean for conventional commercial development that only requires a development order and no rezoning? Analysis is required showing why this is needed and how feasible this will be.

Policy 19.2.2 - Staff does not agree with the complete elimination of the "special case" along Corkscrew Road and adjacent to residential uses. Staff believes it would be an unnecessary regulation. Currently, the special case may only be granted if retail is the only reasonable use of a property in light of its size, proximity to arterials and collectors, and the nature of existing and projected surrounding land uses. There have been very few cases in which the special case has been granted to waive the requirements of retail site location standards. Furthermore, it has been the policy of County staff and the Board of County Commissioners to oppose retail uses along Corkscrew Road, except at the major nodes of US 41, Three Oaks Parkway, and I-75. In those cases where retail uses are located adjacent to residential areas, any application for a special case could be

denied based on the compatibility requirements of the LDC and inconsistency with Policy 5.1.5 and Policy 6.1.4 of the Lee Plan. Staff believes that the provisions for the "special case," given in Policy 6.1.2.8 should remain in place.

Policy 19.2.3 - This proposed policy could result in the commercial "stripping-out" of Corkscrew Road. Staff believes that the phrase "minor commercial uses intended to serve community residents" is subjective and open to endless debate in the rezoning process. The proposed policy opens up Corkscrew Road to commercial uses, while mixed use projects are only "encouraged."

Policy 19.2.4 - Staff is unsure what constitutes a "mixed use development" in this context. Would it simply be a development with more than one distinct type of land use or would it go further to require that residential and commercial uses be truly integrated in such a way to form a semi-independent community where many trips would be captured internally? The submitted application does not propose any incentives. Also, please provide an analysis as to any potential public costs and benefits from providing incentives to developers who elect to create mixed-use projects.

Policy 19.2.5 - Retail uses already exist or are planned along Three Oaks Parkway. An analysis is needed showing that alternatives have been considered and that this policy would be absolutely necessary in light of other Lee Plan policies and the goal of the community. Analysis of the existing and approved retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway is needed. In the context of this policy, what constitutes service uses.

Policy 19.2.6 - The term "detrimental uses" is vague. The policy also does not specify what constitutes "significant outdoor display?" Also, nearly every commercial retail or service use has a storage or delivery area. This policy seems to prevent any retail or service uses from locating within 500' of a residential neighborhood. Is this the intent? Would this policy apply to a multi-family residential neighborhoods? How would this proposed policy effect the proposed Policy 19.2.4, which encourages mixed use development? Would this policy apply when the "detrimental uses" are within the same mixed use development as residential uses?

Policy 19.2.7 - Planned developments already become vacated if they do not comply with the vesting requirements of the LDC (see LDC Sec. 34-381). In staff's opinion this proposed policy is not needed.

Policy 19.2.8 - Staff believes the policy would be more effective if it simply encouraged the interconnections outright instead of requiring LDC amendments at a later date. Please indicate if this alternative has been considered. Staff notes that LDC Section 10-295 already gives the Director of Development Services the ability to require "street stubs" to adjoining property.

Objective 19.3 - The objective, and subsequent Policies, provide no guidance as what constitutes an enhanced buffering requirement. The phrase "strictly evaluating" is not defined and is subjective.

Policy 19.3.1 - How will higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, be encouraged by Lee County?

Policy 19.3.2 - Staff notes that the MPD thresholds have already been lowered. Is the intent to lower the thresholds further?

Policy 19.3.3 - No analysis has been provided that demonstrates that the LDC buffering criteria is inadequate. This Policy, and the community plan in general, does not address how the buffers should be "strengthened."

Policy 19.3.4 - The large residential lots referenced in this policy need to be better defined. Also "transitional density units" need to be better defined to prevent future confusion.

Policy 19.3.5 - Excluding mobile homes has been found by the courts to be discriminatory. Staff can not support the proposed Policy. The proposed Policy makes no sense as a developer/property owner would still have the ability to request mobile home use under conventional zoning. No data or analysis has been presented to warrant limiting these singled out uses.

Objective 19.4 - How must the sited county provisions protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats?

Policy 19.4.1 (bullet 2) - The specified buffer should be a minimum and be a native vegetative buffer.

Policy 19.4.1 (bullet 3) - This provision is poorly worded. The policy could be interpreted as encouraging off-site mitigation. Off-site mitigation should be the last option. Lee County does not permit wetland impacts and mitigation. The Army Corps of Engineers and South Florida Water Management District handle those functions. The Policy is asking for a major change in Board of County Commissioners policy.

Policy 19.4.1 (bullet 4) - The incentives that have been mentioned will require amendments to other sections of the Lee Plan as well as the LDC and Administrative Code. Bonus density provisions would require substantial amendments, which have not been proposed by the applicant. The policy should provide more direction on exactly what documents, and sections within these documents, should be amended, and by what date, to achieve the desired outcome. Analysis is needed showing why incentives should be provided for doing things that are already required by the Lee Plan and LDC during the development review process. Furthermore, it is the opinion of the County that it is illegal to provide impact fee reductions as an incentive for any purpose. Also, impact fees cannot be reduced to encourage the protection of natural resources when there are no impact fees collected for this purpose.

Policy 19.4.2 - Lee County takes a countywide approach to land acquisition.

Policy 19.4.4 - This proposed policy is redundant as it merely states what Lee County is already doing.

Objective 19.5 - Lee County already requires public notification on LDC and Lee Plan changes as well as zoning approvals. The public is made aware of these actions, and it is their choice to participate through the public hearing process or not. Administrative actions, however, do not require public notification or a public hearing. Some examples of administrative approvals might include building permits, fence permits, pool permits, or development orders. How can the County encourage public participation on such administrative actions when they do not require public notification or a hearing? The way this objective is written, it could be interpreted to encourage public participation on some common administrative approvals, which would be unreasonable. Was this the intent? This objective should further define what approvals will be subject to the encouragement of public participation. Also, this requirement seems to open the door to additional LDC amendments that would significantly change what qualifies as an administrative approval in Lee County. These impacts should be considered by the applicant.

Policy 19.5.2 - Lee County has recently revised the public notification requirements. The applicant should evaluate those new requirements. Staff believes this policy is not needed as any landowner within 500 feet of a rezoning would be notified. In some cases this notification would be extended to 750 feet. The proposed policy is not specific enough. For example, the proposed policy does not indicate what actions would be subject to the notification.

Policy 19.5.3 - Please indicate what department in Lee County will be responsible for establishing this clearinghouse, and where it might be established. Also, the estimated costs and public benefit of establishing the clearinghouse should be analyzed. Could the documents cited in the policy possibly be made available at the library or online?

Policy 19.5.4 - The words "Lee County shall require" should be removed. The policy should begin, "The agent for any planned development..." Also, staff believes that conducting the public workshop one week prior to the public hearing does not give interested citizens adequate time to prepare any response to the proposed development. Staff recommends that this workshop be conducted a minimum of sixty days prior to the hearing examiner public hearing. Also, staff believes that any submittal materials should be provided to the proposed document clearing house within one week after they are submitted to the County. Lee County has recently amended the regulations concerning the rezoning process. The applicant should evaluate the amended process.

Objective 19.6 - It is unclear what level of service for community facilities would be necessary to support a "vibrant urban core." The term "vibrant urban core" is not defined.

Policy 19.6.1 - Staff would agree to facilitate communication between the Estero Community and the State of Florida in regard to passive recreational uses on the former Sahdev property. It should

be made clear, however, that the property is now public preserve land, and the uses will be limited by the state of Florida through a management plan.

Policy 19.6.2 - Please indicate how a fence/wall around the historic site would serve to integrate it into the community. Staff fully supports any action that would better integrate the historic site into the community, but would respectfully disagree with the use of a fence/wall around the site as the means to provide integration.

Policy 19.6.3 - Please provide an exhibit that identifies the location of the historic or culturally significant areas that are to be protected by this policy. A map and list of the historic areas with specific historic sites would be beneficial to the planning effort. Phase III of the planning effort calls for the adoption of a Historic Development Overlay. Will this overlay coincide with the historic areas identified in this policy? Have the boundaries of this overlay been explored at this time? If historic uses, rather than historic buildings, must be protected, then these uses must be identified.

Policy 19.6.7 (first numbered Policy 19.6.7) - The Sandy Lane extension is already on the 2020 Transportation Plan, which shows that it is something that Lee County plans to do before the year 2020 if the funding is available. The county is already in the process of acquiring right-of-way for the extension of Sandy Lane. This policy should possibly be reworded. Also note typo: "Sandy Lane" instead of "Land".

Policy 19.6.7 (second numbered Policy 19.6.7) - This issue has already been addressed by the Board of County Commissioners. Staff can not support the proposed policy.

Modification to current Lee Plan provisions:

Policy 6.1.2.1(e) - Staff is unaware of any "Corkscrew Road Mixed Use Village" requirements in any of the County's regulations. This appears to be a waiver of commercial site location standards with no data and analysis to support this departure from a long standing provision that guides intensive retail uses.

Vision Statement - As discussed previously in this memo, the Vision Statement is based on the twenty identified planning communities within Lee County. Estero is not an identified planning community unto itself, therefore, the addition of Estero to the Vision Statement would also require the modification of other references to the planning community of San Carlos/Estero within the Lee Plan. Does this action seek to establish a new planning community for Estero?

Note:

Planning staff is also attaching additional comments that have been forwarded to staff. If I can be of further assistance in this matter, do not hesitate to call me.

HUMPHREY & KNOTT

JAMES T. HUMPHREY
GEORGE H. KNOTT *†
GEORGE L. CONSOER, JR. **
MARK A. EBELINI
GAREY F. BUTLER

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
1625 HENDRY STREET (33901)
P. O. BOX 2449
FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33902-2449

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722

TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446

MUhle@humphreyandknot.com

THOMAS B. HART
MARK A. HOROWITZ
MATTHEW D. UHLE
H. ANDREW SWETT

DIRECTOR OF ZONING AND
LAND USE PLANNING
MICHAEL E. ROEDER, AICP

* Board Certified Civil Trial Lawyer
** Board Certified Real Estate Lawyer
† Board Certified Business Litigation Lawyer

September 22, 2000

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

Re: Estero Community Plan

Dear Mitch:

Our firm represents Koreshan Unity Foundation, Inc., the owner of several parcels consisting of approximately 50 acres in an area bounded by Corkscrew Road, Sandy Lane, U.S. 41, and County Road (a local street located north of the river). One of these parcels contains historic resources; the remainder do not. KUF was and is responsible for the preservation of the culture and history of the original Koreshans; this was done, in part, through the donation of 340 acres that is now the state park. KUF is, and always will be, sensitive to the need to protect the historic character of the area.

KUF, like all non-profits, has to generate revenues to pay its bills. To that end, it has reacquired several properties that were formerly owned by the Foundation. These properties do not contain historic resources. We have been working on a very complicated zoning application over the last year that includes both the historic areas and the reacquired parcels in an effort to assist the Foundation to continue to accomplish its goals. The application will be filed September 22nd.

The application is consistent with the overall objectives of your proposed community plan in a variety of ways, including the following:

1. The application is for a mixed-use development which contains residential, commercial, and community facility uses;
2. The plan shows an Estero River Management Zone and Buffer Area with very limited permitted uses;

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

3. The plan contains open space in a percentage that significantly exceeds the requirements in the LDC;
4. The proposal includes a landscape betterment plan for property along Corkscrew Road, Sandy Lane and U.S. 41 with special limitations on signage; -
5. The plan is consistent with your general concept of village-style development along Corkscrew Road; and
6. The plan preserves the historic character of the parcel to which you refer as the "Theater in the Woods" tract.

Unfortunately, your proposed community plan contains several policies that are inconsistent with our MCP, including the following:

1. Policy 19.1.2: This policy appears to prohibit the use of landscape betterment plans along Corkscrew Road, which is inconsistent with the County Commission's recent decision to approve them as deviations. It should be deleted.
2. Policy 19.1.6 (shown as 19.1.5): The draft plan does not contain a map showing the "Historic Area," so it is impossible for us to determine the precise impact of this policy on the KUF property. We do not know if the "Highlands Avenue/US 41 area" includes the KUF property located at the intersection of U.S. 41 and County Road. We strongly object to the policy as it is currently written and to any notion that the proposed rezoning should be delayed until a "comprehensive Historic Development Overlay can be developed." Since our MCP protects all of the historic resources on the site, there is no reason to delay the zoning case, particularly since we started working on it even before there was any discussion about a community plan. Please delete the second sentence.
3. Policy 19.2.2: As will be explained more thoroughly at next week's public showing of the Foundation Master Plan, the project hinges on a special case finding. The parcel and the plan contain numerous unusual features that justify the special case finding including, but not limited to, the protection of the "Theater in the Woods" tract from large scale commercial uses in spite of its location at the intersection of two arterials. We do not see how this policy accomplishes your objective of encouraging small-scale, attractive, village-type commercial development along Corkscrew Road. We strongly object to this policy, which should be deleted.

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

4. Policy 19.2.3: This policy should not apply to property that is in the Urban Community FLUM category. Map 19 (which, incidentally, has very limited regulatory significance) does not show a node at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, but the presence of a large shopping center at the southeast corner of that intersection makes it obvious that the subject property is suitable for commercial uses in excess of the minor commercial standard.
5. Policy 19.4.1 The policy is vague and unenforceable by Lee County in that all relevant rules are under the jurisdiction of SFWMD. As such, the policy should be deleted.
6. Policy 19.6.3: We do not intend to "convert" the historic resources on the property to other uses. We are, however, proposing a wide range of residential, commercial, and community facilities uses on the various parcels. The language in this policy is too general to permit us to draw a conclusion as to whether it is consistent with our MCP.

It is my understanding that Greg Stuart will be briefing you on the project on September 25th. We are more than willing to provide you with a copy of our zoning application if you would find it helpful in your review of these issues. We can also provide you with information about the historic resources on the property, and we can even give you a tour of the site if you like. We are concerned, however, that these policies were drafted without any detailed knowledge of the KUF property or of our plan. We do not believe that the plan should go forward with the current policies without additional data and review, along with input from the public including, but not limited to, the Koreshan Unity Foundation.

Sincerely,

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.



Matthew D. Uhle

MDU/dr

cc: Charles Dauray
Greg Stuart
Alan Fields
Paul Schryver

g:\mdu\TEMP\hutch21r.

Marsa B. Detsche
1803 Ardmore Rd.
Fort Myers, FL 33901
941.334.3939



September 26, 2000

Gloria Sajgo, AICP, Principal Planner
Lee County Planning Division
P. O. Box 398
Fort Myers, FL 33902-0398

RE: Preliminary Draft of the Estero Community Plan

Dear Gloria:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Preliminary Draft of the Estero Community Plan. I preface my observations with a few comments. Firstly, I strongly endorse any community's efforts to articulate a community vision as a community-building and forward-thinking activity. I believe it is important that a community develops this vision through a widely participative process, ensuring the greatest opportunity for all to provide input and consideration. Secondly, I found it difficult to limit my comments to the narrow scope of historic preservation. Past experiences in planning, visioning, and community-building made it impossible for me to overlook the rest of the document. Finally, I appreciate the fact that this is a draft document, prepared within a limited time frame. However, there are many blank pages containing missing exhibits and tables which might explain some of my comments.


- The only reference to (the first) Table 3 appears on page 10. If the purpose of this table is to illustrate public perceptions of projected growth, this could be accomplished more succinctly. Since the data in Table 2 is missing, it is unclear whether or not this public perception data warrants a large portion of this report.
- It appears that a primary impetus of this report is the articulation and preservation of lifestyle issues important to the community. The report contains dwelling unit and population estimates, a summary of dwelling units approved for development, and will include population projections (blank Table 2). However, we know nothing of these people. More expansive demographic data (e.g. household sizes, ages, household income levels, etc.) will facilitate a clearer picture of projected impacts on quality of life issues, such as public facilities, environment, transportation, employment generation, and so on. This data would be important to ascertain whether or not the assertions that the current development pattern as depicted on the FLUM is indeed "appropriate for guiding the future growth of the community".
- There are two tables labeled Table 3 (pages 9 and 13).
- There are repeated references to community priorities as expressed by the community members. It would have been helpful to see these in Table # on page 22.
- Suggestions to develop a Historic Overlay may be unnecessary since the County has an Historic Preservation Ordinance. Existing preservation mechanisms may be adequate to

address the historic preservation objectives, rather than creating another land development regulation. In my experience, "overlays" are not well received in the development community.

- Item 6 on page 30: I do not have a copy of the Lee Plan; however, it would appear that these items are (or should be) considered at this time and should not need to be particular to Estero.
- Phraseology used in several of the Objectives and Policies presented (pp. 32-36) include ill-defined concepts that can become sources of conflict. Examples include "visually attractive" (Objective 19.1), "tasteful" (Objective 19.2), "strictly evaluating" (Objective 19.3), and "necessary to support" (Objective 19.6). Use of absolutes may also become problematic, such as "may not approve any deviation" (Policy 19.1.2), "all commercial developments" (Policy 19.2.1), and "may not be permitted" (Policy 19.2.2). The "significant incentives" in Policy 19.4.1 may conflict with other policies that are absolutes (e.g. Policy 19.1.2).
- Policy 19.2.1: I question the practicality of such requirement.
- How does Objective 19.5 differ from current practice? Is there a local group or recognized organization willing to assume this responsibility?
- Policy 19.1.5 and Policy 19.6.3: An Historic Preservation Ordinance exists. Historic District designation may be appropriate for the "historic area".
- Phase II, Proposed Action 1. In developing roadway landscaping requirements, there must be a careful consideration of landscaping with respect to commercial building and signage visibility. Parallel efforts to create signage "consistent with the community vision" may conflict with other aesthetic efforts. Success of such a program must reflect a balance between roadway appearance and building visibility.
- Proposed Action 5. It is unclear what is inadequate in the current submittal process.
- Proposed Action 6. See comment above regarding Policy 19.2.1.
- Phase III, Proposed Action 1. I commented earlier on the proposal for the creation of a Historic Development Overlay. Nonetheless, if historic preservation is important to the community, it should not be included in Phase III; appropriate measures need to be implemented as soon as practicable.
- Page 38 is blank, and there is no page 39.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to review Estero's draft Plan. I hope my comments are helpful in the preparation and consideration of the Plan. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Marsa B. Detscher, AICP

RESPONSE TO ESTERO COMMUNITY PLAN: PRELIMINARY DRAFT

from: Quentin Quesnell, local historian; Roe/Straut professor in the humanities,
Smith College.

Considering the short time in which it had to be prepared, the draft is very good. However it is difficult to render a serious opinion on several important points because the supporting charts, tables, and maps are only named in this draft and not actually included. I will touch only some highlights of particular interest to me.

I.

Table 2 and table 3.

Table 2 "2020 population projections based on data and analysis" would seem to be the most important part of our planning. But it is not included. Instead we are given Table 3: "Community-expected population by 2020, which is nothing but the arbitrary guesses of 93 people. The answers are interesting for a sense of community feeling; but they have no scientific value and they are too wildly divergent to allow basing any plans on them.

But worse still, Table 3 concludes with an "average population answer" into which 27 non-responses have been averaged just as if they were 27 predictions that the population will be zero. But even if those 27 non-responses had been laid aside, an average of the remaining 93 responses would not be very useful. Suppose for instance that even one respondent had been a believing Koreshan who answered in terms of the published plans of Koresh in 1904: "Estero will soon be a city of ten million." That one further response would have changed the average predicted population to 113,665.

I suggest that the table stand as is, but that "AVERAGE POPULATION ANSWER" be replaced by a short verbal analysis of the responses. For instance: "Of the 93 persons who did answer this question, 51 projected a population between 30,000 and 60,000. Only 19 thought the population would be less than 20,000 and only 16 picked a figure between 20,000 and 30,000."

II..The boundaries of the Estero Community.

The "recommended boundaries of the Estero Community"(p.4) illustrated in Exhibit 2 do not include Mound Key and the mouth of the Estero River. Estero cannot be understood without Mound Key and the mouth of the Estero River. They are the heart of its history from the 16th century on, as will be amply illustrated in the book I am preparing for the Estero Historical Society.

Page 4 claims that the recommended boundaries include essentially the Estero Fire District. But on my copy of the Estero Fire District map, Mound Key is a part of the Estero district. Only the postal zip code 33928 cuts it off from Estero. The issue for our community plan is not simply how many people live there today, but what role this piece of land can play in our own self-understanding. Even as a State of Florida archaeological preserve, Mound Key will need local protectors and advocates in the near future. The citizens of Estero are the natural candidates for those roles.

III. Planned Development Approvals.

The future land use map (FLUM) and Exhibit 3 (pp. 10ff.) are missing. They would be very helpful.

The explicit figures on p. 13 explaining the relation between living space and commercial development space are helpful. But the community probably wants to know not only what the projections are but what will actually be allowed. Is there a provision in law anywhere that says these projections may not be exceeded and that takes away the commissioners' power to approve development beyond those projections? Isn't that the kind of thing the community is concerned about?

The discussion on p. 13 of "another source of frustration" is too gentle. Does use of bubble MCP result only in "perceived uncertainty"? Even if most projects are "adequately articulated," the fact that there have also been "recent notable exceptions" means that community frustration has resulted from more than perceived uncertainty. It is frustration over engineered uncertainty, pressing the details of what the law allows in order to obscure and conceal what the community really has a right to know.

IV. Natural Resources.

The discussion on p. 13 is also too gentle. Whatever the perceptions, the community has articulated the common sense position that if we now need any water restrictions, we should not go on approving further demands for water until we are certain where the extra water is going to come from. The need for water restrictions is always a common sense red signal of danger. The proper thing to do is to stop and look around again before proceeding. All the plans mentioned on p. 14, "continuing to work with private developers," etc. are good, but planning, encouraging, and working with can also be nothing but promises, promises.

V. Historic Resources (p. 18ff.)

Very good suggestions. However, the fact that the "map depicting the historic area" is not in fact included makes the suggestions on p. 19 seem to be aimed at the area which is already a state park. In fact, it is "the surrounding Community of Estero" which has abundant resources subject to loss through careless development. The "historic area" map should include the area between East Broadway and Corkscrew, from Hwy 41 at least to Sandy Lane.

VI. Development approval process (p. 24)

This is very important; but has to be implemented in a way that is not too burdensome to developers and even homeowners. To multiply excessively the persons and organizations that must be explicitly notified is risky and may end up with the notification becoming practically meaningless (like

some of the official land and zoning notices in technical language posted in the newspapers just to fulfill legal requirements).

Might it not be more effective to choose now one or two organizations of large membership and recognized standing to maintain a watchdog committee. Official notice would be sent to this organization and it would be their responsibility to pursue anything that seemed to require further attention. They would then translate the issue into laypersons' language and alert their membership and other organizations that something of general interest was underway.

Perhaps this is the place to include in the plan mention of the existence of the gated communities. They are natural organizational units within Estero and they could be recognized and made use of as a way of reaching the citizenship on this and similar issues.

VII. SOME GENERAL REFLECTIONS.

As with the last point mentioned, the gated communities, there are several large issues that are a part of envisioning the future and could be called to people's attention in this planning process. For instance, what percentage of the population already lives in the gated communities? Do we want that to be the pattern of living for the next 30,000 people to move in here? To what extent do these already existing organized communities want to be separate? Or do they prefer to be unconcerned over any larger community called Estero? As islands within Estero, they probably rightly expect great independence in decisions about beautification, landscaping, building design. But even as islands, they could be units of "government" within Estero, the fastest and easiest way to ascertain and to cultivate community feeling on many issues.

The suggestions under point 3. Detailed Master Planning (p. 25f.) for developing focal points, not just for practicality but for making visible the existence of Estero by attention to the impressions of anyone driving through north and south or even east-west, are very good. The plan should be given wide enough distribution to get the community talking about these things, as also about the need to choose now sites for schools, playgrounds, parks, community centers, clinics, meeting places. On the other hand, once we choose them, how are they to be provided? Estero has no funds to buy lands and no authority of eminent domain. Perhaps the plan could say more clearly to whom suggestions can be made and how that person or office will be responsible for handling the suggestions, what account they will have to make eventually and to whom.

Should there not be express mention at some point of how all this is complicated by the fact that more than a third of our dwelling units are only seasonally occupied and more than a third of the population are

seasonal? For instance, surely the move to create this Community Plan, from the Ford-dealership story on down, would have been different if it had all happened between January and March rather than from July to September. Again, this fact ought to be a topic of extended discussion in the community, because it will always be a source of difficulties. What are the items that the year-round residents and the seasonal residents both want? That is where our real strength lies.

A vision for the future will be built around major features of Estero already in existence—a restored and living river, the bay, Mound Key, the waterfront park lands; the State Park, the high school, the university, the Teco arena; highway 41 and Corkscrew, not just for transportation but to convey to the world an image of a place that is self-aware and proud; the gated communities, the trailer parks, the churches, the historic district. An introduction-to-Estero map should be created for newcomers, one which features only such items. It would not attempt to list all the streets, but only to single out against a general geographical backdrop all that most makes Estero what it is. Publishing such a map in even the simplest, roughest form would be a great stimulus to community comment and discussion.

Quentin Quesnell
September 25, 2000

JAMES T. HUMPHREY
GEORGE H. KNOTT*†
GEORGE L. CONSOER, JR.**
MARK A. EBELINI
GAREY F. BUTLER

*Board Certified Civil Trial Lawyer
**Board Certified Real Estate Lawyer
†Board Certified Business Litigation Lawyer

HUMPHREY & KNOTT

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

1625 HENDRY STREET (33901)
P. O. BOX 2449
FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33902-2449

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722

TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446

MUhle@humphreyandknott.com

LEES COUNTY
SEP 25 2000
PLANNING CNTR.

THOMAS B. HART
MARK A. HOROWITZ
MATTHEW D. UHLE
H. ANDREW SWETT

DIRECTOR OF ZONING AND
LAND USE PLANNING
MICHAEL E. ROEDER, AICP

September 22, 2000

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

RE: Estero Community Plan

Dear Mitch:

Our firm represents John Madden, Trustee, the owner of the parcel west of U.S. 41 that is commonly known as Estero Greens. The property is zoned CPD. The owner is currently seeking development order approval for an automobile dealership on a portion of the 24-acre site. As you are undoubtedly aware, the dealership was the source of considerable controversy, and the issue is in litigation.

The LDC currently provides that planned development zonings are vacated after five years unless the applicant applies for a development order for a "substantial portion" of the project within that time frame. Once the applicant has complied with that requirement, however, the zoning remains in place indefinitely so long as the developer adheres to the phasing schedule, if any, shown on the MCP. Your proposed Policy 19.2.7, however, directs the County to consider the possibility of adopting new regulations which would apparently have the effect of vacating all existing planned developments, even if they have already met all of the current vesting requirements, after five years. When read in connection with proposed Policy 19.2.6, this policy would result in the elimination of the automobile dealership use from the schedule of uses for Estero Greens, which would substantially diminish the value of the property.

There can be no doubt that the purpose of the proposed policy is to divest projects that the County currently considers to be vested. At best, it would only address projects which are merely in the development order process; at worst, it would destroy the effectiveness, not just of vested zonings, but of outstanding development orders as well. It will have a major impact, not just on Estero Greens, but on every planned development in the Estero area. The potential Bert Harris Act liability for the County could be enormous.

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

The County currently has the legal ability to require projects that have been vacated to comply with its most recent regulations. We believe that is as far as the County can, or should, go.

Sincerely,

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.



Matthew D. Uhle

MDU/dr

cc: Rick Marchetta
Greg Stuart
Richard Collman, Esq.
Timothy Jones, Esq.
Paul O'Connor



Department of Environmental Protection

Jeb Bush
Governor

Koreshan State Historic Site
PO Box 7
Estero, FL 33928
(941)992-0311

David B. Struhs
Secretary

September 25, 2000

Mr. Mitchel A. Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

SEP 27 AM 9:00
LEE QUINCY
W/

Dear Mr. Hutchcraft,

I have taken the time to review the Preliminary Draft of The Estero Community Plan and have the following comments:

The state park should be referred to as Koreshan State Historic Site throughout the document.

The Koreshan Unity Settlement is a National Historic District. The portion of the Koreshan Unity Settlement Historic District found in Koreshan State Historic Site is located within a 40 acre parcel adjacent to US Highway 41. The District extends to the east, across US Highway 41 on the grounds currently managed by the Koreshan Unity Foundation. The total acreage of the state park is 192.6 acres. Mound Key State Archaeological Site a 166.6 acre parcel found on the island of Mound Key is located at the mouth of the Estero River and is also managed by staff at Koreshan S.H.S. Accessible by boat, Mound Key is a highly significant resource that should be considered in this plan as well.

Twelve historic structures, seven landscape features, extensive artifact and archival collections are maintained by the park. The Koreshan Unity Settlement is not maintained by the state as a "religious shrine". The national register nomination form prepared by the Department of State, Division of Historic Resources in 1975 described the significance of the site as follows:

"The physical remains of the Koreshan community are preserved because they represent a unique philosophical and religious movement, because they illustrate a cooperative settlement of the past era and because they are remnants of a pioneer community which, in many ways, typified life on the south Florida frontier around the turn of the twentieth century. The extant gardens are of value to tropical horticulturalists."

Accurate representation of the site is crucial to the support and success of community planning efforts.

"Protect, Conserve and Manage Florida's Environment and Natural Resources"

Printed on recycled paper.

Mitchel Hutchcraft
September 25, 2000
Page 2

Management guidelines for the park are described in Unit Management Plans for both parks. Unit plan development has directly involved input from community representation in a DEP Advisory Groups. The Advisory Group for the Koreshan State Historic Site Unit Management Plan met in March, 2000 to provide input in the development of the current plan.

Unit Plans provide a management program overview, a description of the resources as well as conceptual land use plans that guide activities associated with natural and cultural resource management and any facility development. Any needs, uses or facility development described in the community plan which directly involve the use of state lands associated with these parks should reflect the management direction described in the plan. If you would like to review a copy of the unit plan, please let me know.

Policy 19.1.5 and Policy 19.6.2 creation of a public plaza/interpretive area for vehicular access would be difficult with the congestion, noise and traffic levels that currently exist. Safety concerns at the junction of US Highway 41 and Corkscrew Road would present serious drawbacks. Pedestrian/bicycle access to the park from US Highway 41, along Corkscrew Road is currently non-existent and is desperately needed to provide resident access into the park. Any proposal to consider a change in the current park access must take into account traffic speed and flow, the size of vehicles that regularly enter the park as well as the number of vehicles that attend special events. Noise levels and traffic vibration emanating from US Highway 41 have raised concerns for the need for landscaping, fences and walls to protect the cultural resources as well as restore the tranquility of the park setting. The park is willing to work closely with the community with those goals in mind.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments during the process of developing this plan. Strong community support has served Koreshan State Historic Site well during my tenure as Park Manager. I look forward to creating a stronger relationship with the residents of Estero by continuing to work with them.

Sincerely


Jeanne M. Parks
Park Manager

Cc: Michael K. Murphy, Chief, Bureau of Parks, District 4
✓ Gloria M. Sajgo, Principal Planner, Lee County
Bill Grace, President, Koreshan Unity Alliance
file

PLANNING DIVISION



MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Noble, AICP, Principal Planner

From: Gloria M. Sajgo, AICP, Principal Planner 

Subject: Comments on the Preliminary Draft of the Estero Community Plan

Date: September 20, 2000

Page 9 the purpose of Table 3 Community Expected Population by 2020 is unclear.

Page 18 the name of the historic document produced by Florida Preservation Services is Lee County Historic Sites Survey

Page 19 and Page 24 With regards to how to protect historic structures and whether to establish a community based architectural standards review board, it is important to consider that Lee County has a historic preservation ordinance that can regulate both historic and non-historic buildings.

Lee County has an active historic preservation program and a very effective historic preservation ordinance. Being designated under the Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 22 of the LDC) would most effectively protect historic structures; changes to historic buildings are reviewed per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Also if an area were designated as a historic district then in addition to reviewing changes to historic buildings, the ordinance would allow for the review of changes to non-historic buildings through the adoption of design guidelines.

This ordinance has been in place for 10 years and has proven record protecting individual historic resources as well as large scale historic districts like Boca Grande and Matlacha. (In both of these districts, historic and non-historic buildings are subject to review.) This ordinance is modeled after the best preservation ordinances in the country and meets the state and federal requirements for Certified Local Governments.

This ordinance is implemented by the Lee County Planning staff and the Lee County Historic Preservation Board, a 7 member board whose members are appointed on the basis their of profession or area of expertise and not on the basis of where they live.

Objective 19.1 is hard to measure since what constitutes a visually attractive community is not identified or defined. The phrase “visually attractive” is too subjective to serve as an effective regulatory standard.

Policy 19.1.1 The phrase “...signage consistent with the Community Vision and architectural standards”...would be hard to implement as the vision statement provides little guidance as to what signage would be appropriate and there are no defined or identified architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: A flat prohibition against a deviation is usually too rigid to be applied fairly in the day to day permitting process.

Policy 19.1.3. It is unclear what is meant by “older projects” and what type of incentives these projects would need.

The Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 22 of the LDC) has provisions for zoning relief for designated historic structures that do not meet current zoning regulations. Also the designated historic structures are exempt from FEMA flood regulations and the Building Official has some discretionary latitude so that modern building codes are applied in manner that do not destroy the historic character of a designated resource.

Policy 19.1.4: This policy is similar to 19.6.6. The two could be made to dovetail each other better.

Policy 19.1.5 This policy should reference the Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance, which is already implemented, rather suggesting that a new concept: a Historic Development Overlay district be implemented.

Objective 19.2 is hard to measure since what constitutes “tasteful shopping and employment opportunities” and the “community character” is not defined. These phrases are too subjective to serve as effective regulatory standards.

Policy 19.2.1 Requiring all commercial development to be reviewed as a commercial planned development might not be practical.

Policy 19.2.3 This policy needs to be more definite. How will non-residential uses be encouraged to be mixed use in nature and allow for residential uses? What are minor commercial uses?

Policy 19.2.4. What specific regulations must be adopted or amended to encourage or “incentivize” mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road.

Policy 19.2.5 How will Lee County discourage retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway in favor of service and residential uses?

Objective 19.3 seems hard to measure, as the phrase “strictly evaluating” is not defined. (The word strictly is too subjective to be an effective regulatory standard.)

Policy 19.3.1. How will higher density residential developments with a mix of unit types be encouraged?

Policy 19.3.3. A good way to protect large lot residential areas is to prohibit the creation of small lots from these larger lots. Is this applicable to this area?

Objective 19.4 What county regulations, policies and discretionary actions must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats? How must they protect or enhance them?

Policy 19.4.2 Lee County takes a countywide approach to land acquisition. It is unrealistic to expect the county to focus its acquisition efforts on the area east of I-75 and along Estero Bay in the absence of a clearly demonstrated immediate need or threat.

Policy 19.4.4. merely states what Lee County is already doing.

Objective 19.5 This public participation objective is a bit unwieldy. Requiring that Lee County *encourage and solicit* public input and participation to and during the *review and adoption* of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, zoning approvals and *administrative actions* seems unrealistic. A more specific approach identifying the type of notice or participation requirement for each type of government action would be more implementable.

Policy 19.5.1 Development approvals are done by staff without public input.

Policy 19.5.3 What type of issue would trigger a public notice to persons within 500’?


Policy 19.5.3. What does a document clearinghouse mean?

Objective 19.6 It is unclear what level of service for community facilities would be necessary to support a “vibrant urban core”. What is a “vibrant urban core”/

Policy 19.6.3. If historic uses – rather than historic buildings – must be protected, then these uses must be identified.

Policy 19.6.6. This policy should dovetail policy 19.1.4.

S: \historic\estero\estero preliminary draft



14. Are there any other issues that you think ought to be addressed?
as we proceed with the Estero Community Plan?

15. What issues do you feel are important relative to past growth?

16. What issues do you feel are important relative to future growth?

17. Are there any other recommendations on land use that you
want to offer?

18. Please identify any problems or opportunities with specific
natural resources that you would like addressed.

Facilities and Services

19. Please rank the following public facilities and services based
on your perception of the relative need for improvement.

| Rank Importance (1 most to 14 least) | Facility/Service | Comment |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|
| | Roads | |
| | Bike Paths | |
| | Water Supply | |
| | Drainage | |
| | Solid Waste | |
| | Parks and Recreation | |
| | Fire Protection | |
| | Library | |
| | Education | |
| | Culture | |
| | Religion | |
| | Law Enforcement | |
| | Health Care | |

Estero Community Plan

Public Workshop #1 Questionnaire

August 15, 2000

Vanasse & Daylor is working in cooperation with the **Estero Chamber of Commerce**, the **Estero Concerned Citizens Association**, the **Estero Civic Association**, and the **Residents of Estero** to develop a Community Plan for the Estero Community. The Community Plan will address issues relating to land use, public facilities and services, natural resources and housing. This questionnaire is intended to gather an initial indication of the interests and priorities of the residents of the Estero Community.

Please complete the questionnaire and mail it to Vanasse & Daylor, LLP at the address listed below, or drop it by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, by August 23, 2000.

Mail the questionnaire to:
Diane Wakeman, Administrative Coordinator
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
12730 New Brittany Boulevard, Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907
(941) 437-4601



General

1. What general area do you consider to be your neighborhood?

2. What do you envision Estero to look like in 2010? What character do you want it to have?

3. Given the current year-round population of approximately 5,000, how big do you see the Estero Community in 20 years?

Character

4. Would you support changes to the existing signage regulation? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

5. Would you support changes to the landscaping regulations? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

6. Would you support changes to architectural requirements? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

Land Use - Residential

7. Are there areas of the Estero community that you think should be identified for higher density uses?

8. Are there areas that of the Estero community that you think should be identified for lower density uses?

Land Use - Commercial

9. Are there areas of the Estero community that you think should be identified for higher intensity uses?

10. Are there areas that of the Estero community that you think should be identified for lower intensity uses?

11. Are there any specific commercial uses you would like to encourage or discourage within the Community?

Other

12. What, if anything, would you like to see changed in the Estero community?

13. Have you ever participated in a public hearing or zoning process? Yes _____ No _____ Would you recommend any changes?

Memo

To: Paul O'Connor, Planning Division Director

From: David Loveland, Planning Program Director *DML*

Date: June 8, 2001

Subject: **Estero Community Plan
Proposed Amendments to Lee Plan Goals,
Objectives and Policies**

LEE COUNTY
RECEIVED
01 JUN 12 AM 9:49
COUNTY DEV/
PUB. WORKS CNTR.
SP. PLAN FL/DOR

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed amendments to the Lee Plan for the Estero community, in the form of a new Goal 19 and related objectives and policies. The Department of Transportation has a concern about proposed new Policy 19.6.6, which reads as follows:

Policy 19.6.6: In order to protect health, safety, welfare and community character, Lee County will continue to monitor truck traffic along Corkscrew Road (from Alico Road to US 41) as a connecting road to US 41 and I-75, to evaluate the impact on adjacent residential communities.

The proposed policy deals with an operational issue at a specific location, with no identified time frame for how long such monitoring would continue. As a matter of operational practice, DOT monitors particular problem locations all around the County on an as-needed basis, and we are currently monitoring the truck traffic situation on Corkscrew Road based on a perceived problem identified by the community with truck speeds and we will be making periodic reports to the BOCC on our findings. However, the policy as written would require perpetual monitoring of this one location, which restricts our ability to address other problem areas around the County with our limited resources and which ignores the potential that the perceived problem gets addressed. There are a number of physical improvements planned on Corkscrew Road which should make for safer travel in the near future, including turn lane additions, four-laning and the addition of paved shoulders and the installation of new traffic signals. DOT staff feels the policy is unnecessary and burdens our resources and should be deleted.

DML/mlb

cc: Administrative File

PLANNING DIVISION

M E M O R A N D U M



LEE COUNTY

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA

to: Local Planning Agency Members
from: Paul O'Connor, AICP, Director of Planning
subject: CPA 2000-19, Estero Community Plan
date: July 18, 2001

At the June 25, 2001 meeting of the Local Planning Agency, the LPA voted to transmit the majority of the amendment for the Estero Community Plan. Several items from this amendment, however, were tabled for further consideration. Staff has reexamined those items and offers the following recommendations for the LPA to consider at the July 23, 2001 public hearing.

PROPOSED POLICY 19.2.5

Staff's Recommended Language from the June 25th Hearing:

Policy 19.2.5: Lee County prohibits "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code), free-standing nightclubs or lounges, retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre, and storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

The LPA tabled this particular policy so that staff could clarify several issues.

"Lounges" are not a defined term in the Land Development Code (LDC). Staff believes that references to specific uses in the Lee Plan should correspond to the terminology provided in the LDC. The LDC specifically defines the term "bar and cocktail lounge," and staff recommends using this terminology in Policy 19.2.5. The term "nightclub" is also specifically defined in the Land Development Code. This term is different from "bar and cocktail lounge," and should be treated as such in the proposed policy language.

An issue was raised at the June 25th hearing about the existing or pending projects that might be made non-conforming if this policy is adopted. Staff conducted a cursory review of approved commercial planned developments in Estero, some of which are developed, but many of which are still vacant. In reviewing the list of uses approved in these projects, staff found that many of them contained uses that would be prohibited by this new policy. These uses include, but are not limited to Contractors and Builders, Rental or Leasing Establishments, Vehicle and Equipment Dealers, Bar and Cocktail Lounges, and Nightclubs. The LPA questioned what would happen to these approved uses if this new policy was adopted.

In response, staff believes that Chapter XIII, *Procedures and Administration*, Item a., *Effect and Legal Status of the Plan* addresses this issue. Item D. reads as follows:

D. In addition to above-mentioned development orders, preliminary and final development orders, the following categories of approvals, projects, and developments will be deemed to be consistent with the Lee Plan, subject to the applicable conditions as set forth below:

Item 7 under this heading specifically addresses the issue of how to deal with uses approved within planned developments that might be inconsistent with this new policy.

7. "planned development" zoning approvals which have not been vacated due to inactivity by the developer;

Staff believes that if a development was previously approved in Estero for any of the uses that would be subject to the proposed Policy 19.2.5, then those uses would remain consistent with the Lee Plan because of the policy shown above. Any planned developments that are already approved for these uses would be legally non-conforming if this policy was adopted. If the planned development zoning is vacated, then the provisions in Item D.7. above would not apply, and the development would be subject to the new provisions of Policy 19.2.5.

As a side note, staff believes that the proposed Policy 19.2.5 might not have the effect that the Estero group is seeking. While the policy will prohibit freestanding bar and cocktail lounges as well as night clubs, it would not prohibit them from locating in a shopping center or plaza. In staff's experience, there are very few new freestanding bars or night clubs being established anywhere in the County. These establishments are generally found in shopping centers. This is not an item of concern to staff, but it should be pointed out for the record.

Staff is also concerned about the creation of a new policy in the Lee Plan to strictly prohibit certain uses without having any data and analysis to support it. Staff believes that in the absence of data and analysis, the creation of this policy appears to be arbitrary and not based on sound planning principles.

Revised Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that if Policy 19.2.5 is to be transmitted, the following language should be used. Changes made since the June 25th meeting are shown in strike-out and double underline format.

Policy 19.2.5: ~~The Estero Community will propose regulations for Lee County to review, amend or adopt that prohibits~~ The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land

Development Code); free-standing nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges; or and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre, and storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was lengthy discussion at the June 25 hearing about the proposed objective and policies relating to public participation. At that time, staff made the following recommendation on the proposed public participation language:

Staff's Recommended Language from June 25th Hearing:

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County shall will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, and zoning approvals, and development orders.

~~Policy 19.5.1: Lee County shall register groups within the Estero Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, development code amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates.~~

~~Policy 19.5.2: Lee County shall establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available.~~

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Community, in coordination with zoning staff, shall must conduct one public workshop within two weeks of the project being found sufficient.

Staff has revisited these policies since the last LPA meeting, and is still not comfortable with placing all of these requirements in the Lee Plan. With regard to Policy 19.5.1, staff believes that providing notification on all ordinances and "development approvals" would require a significant increase in the County's level of service. The volume of ordinances and "development approvals" that the County deals with on a daily basis is so large that it would not be practical to send written notification on all of these items. On the other hand, staff believes that some form of notification for Lee Plan and Land Development Code amendments would be feasible. Staff would be willing to send a copy of an agenda to registered groups, and if these groups wanted more information on

any particular item, then they could contact the County for further information. Currently, staff provides such information to any interested parties on request, and staff is somewhat hesitant to take the lead in determining which items the Estero Community would want to examine in more detail. Typically, staff would respond to a citizen request for information, but would not initiate the distribution of this information. Staff would be willing to notify registered groups on selected items or issues, such as Lee Plan and Land Development Code amendments, but could not do so for every ordinance or "development approval." Staff would do this as a courtesy only.

With regard to Policy 19.5.2, there is still some uncertainty as to what items would be sent to the document clearing house. Staff believes that the intent of the Estero Planning Group was for this policy to apply to documents related to rezonings in Estero. Typically, a zoning file contains several versions of the same documents, all of which add up to large volumes of paperwork. Staff believes that the most appropriate thing to do would be to send only the original submittal documents to the clearing house. This would give the Estero residents a comprehensive overview of the proposed project.

The Estero Planning Group has suggested the South County Regional Library as a potential location for this document clearing house. Staff believes that the library would be a logical place for the clearing house, but staff is still concerned about what will happen to the documents that the County would send to the library. There are no assurances that the library is willing to accept these materials, and there are no assurances that the library is willing to put forth a continuing effort to catalog and shelve the zoning materials. Staff is not comfortable with assuming that the library will be willing to take on this additional responsibility. If the LPA decides to transmit Policy 19.5.2, staff has proposed transmittal language below.

The proposed Policy 19.5.3 addresses the public workshop that would be conducted by the agent handling a rezoning request. The main concern from staff is that procedures for this "public workshop" are not specifically defined. There are many uncertainties and questions that need to be answered. Do the workshops need to be advertised? Do minutes need to be kept? Where will the workshop take place, and who will arrange the location? What are the agent's responsibilities at these workshops? What if no citizens are interested in attending the workshop? Staff is not opposed to the requirements of Policy 19.5.3, but staff also believes that these uncertainties will need to be addressed as these public workshops are conducted in the future. Staff recommends transmittal of this policy, with the language provided by staff below. Staff further recommends that the issues related to this proposed policy continue to be examined for possible consideration in future amendment cycles.

Revised Staff Recommendation:

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County shall will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land

Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions policies, and zoning approvals, and development orders.

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County shall will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: Lee County shall The Estero Community will establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or and resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community, in coordination with zoning staff, shall must conduct one public workshop informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted within thirty (30) days after the zoning request is submitted two weeks of the project being found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

Executive Summary

Executive Summary

The Estero Community Plan

Phase I

Presented to the Estero Community on September 19, 2000

The Estero Community Plan Phase I marks an important first step in an on-going process to address the future growth, character and quality of life within the Estero Community. The Community Plan incorporates recommendations on the adoption of guiding principles into the Lee Plan. The provisions recommended by this Community Plan will not only guide actual development requests, but also the development of future Land Development Code regulations and site specific Land Use Map Amendments.

The Estero Community Plan is the result of a grass roots effort to address concerns over the potential loss of quality of life in Estero, and to provide the residents and landowners with an understanding of what to expect in the future. The six person Estero Community Master Plan Committee, which is comprised of representatives from the Estero Chamber of Commerce, the development community, and the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization (ECCO), now coordinates this grass roots effort. Input from individuals and organizations is encouraged through these representatives, as well as through direct communication with the consultant.

As a result of the work of this Committee, and the one-month public input process that consisted of questionnaires, workshops, a survey of existing conditions and direct communication with the Chamber of Commerce, ECCO, the Lee County Department of Community Development and residents of Estero, the following key community issues were identified.

Key Community Issues:

- **Community Character** – The community has expressed the desire to implement a stronger community planning approach to proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage, and the location and type of certain land uses.
- **Residential Land Uses** – The community identified a desire to maintain a “small town” feel, and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment.
- **Commercial Land Uses** – The community has a strong desire to limit “tourist oriented uses”, “detrimental uses” and high intensity uses along specific corridors. However, there is a recognized need for small-scale retail that services adjacent neighborhoods.
- **Natural Resources** – The community expressed a strong desire to protect groundwater resources, wetlands and other aquatic habitats through acquisition, incentives, and regulations.
- **Public Participation** – The community has requested the opportunity to become more actively and meaningfully involved in the development approval process.
- **Community Resources** – The community has expressed a desire for the expansion of certain community resources, including a community center, meeting area, and governmental service offices – such as a post office.

In response to these community "Action Items", and with the support of the evaluation of existing conditions, the Estero Community Plan presents detailed Goals, Objectives and Policies that should be adopted into Goal 19 of the Lee Plan to formally establish and begin the implementation of the Community Vision. These recommendations will be submitted to Lee County on September 29, 2000 for consideration during the 2000 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle.

In order to further implement the Community Vision, the Estero Community Plan outlines more specific amendments that should be undertaken by the Estero Community Planning Committee during the Phase II Land Development Code amendment process. These additional efforts include the following:

- The development of additional landscaping and signage regulations.
- The evaluation of architectural requirements.
- Adjustments to the Planned Development Submittal and Review Process.
- The refinement of the Planned Development Permitted Use list within the Estero Community.
- Modification to buffer, setback and height requirements.
- Adjustments to road access and interconnection requirements.
- The development of a Historic Development Overlay Concept for the Historic Areas.
- The development of a Mixed Use Village Overlay for the Corkscrew Road Area.

These amendments will be initiated upon the Community's direction, and may begin as early as October 2000. Similarly, Phase III of the Community Plan includes a final round of Comprehensive Plan Amendments. This Phase is recommended for the September 2001 round of Comprehensive Plan Amendments, and will outline detailed amendments to the Lee Plan to adopt specific map amendments that result from the Land Development Code and Master Planning Process.

It is important to applaud the Community for undertaking this process, and actively working on outlining a foundation for the future of the Community. Continued public input and participation is even more important as additional refinements are made to the local development regulations. The work that is being done today will not only have an impact on your community in the near future, but its results will be seen for generations.

Section Six: Recommendations

The recommendations from Phase I of the Estero Community Plan are targeted at establishing a vision for the community, and to provide the Lee Plan with guidance for future community development issues within Estero. The proposed Lee Plan amendments fall into six primary categories: Community Character, Commercial Land Use, Residential Land Use, Natural Resources, the Development Approval Process, and Community Facilities. Presented below are the proposed Goals, Objectives and Policies intended to begin to establish the type of community envisioned by the residents.

Vision Statement:

"To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

GOAL 19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. Lee County shall establish, enhance and enforce regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2001, Lee County shall review, amend or establish Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering and shading of parking areas, signage consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County may not approve any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work with private property owners to establish incentives for bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: Lee County and the Estero Community shall work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish a town commons that encourages the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities. Ideally, this town commons shall be located south of Corkscrew Road and north of The Brooks, and shall be between US 41 and I-75.

Policy 19.1.5: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to enhance the Koreshan State Park in such a manner that it is more visually integrated with the Community along US 41, provides for enhanced pedestrian/bicycle access, and includes a public plaza/interpretive area at the corner of US 41 and Corkscrew Road.

Policy 19.1.5: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the property owners within the Historic Area to encourage development that is consistent with the historic nature of the Highlands Avenue/US 41 area. This should include the prohibition of significant conversion of land area until a comprehensive Historic Development Overlay can be developed.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future county regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that tasteful shopping and employment opportunities are provided, while maintaining the community character.

Policy 19.2.1: All commercial developments within the Estero Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses shall be in compliance with the Retail Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" may not be permitted along Corkscrew Road or adjacent to any residential use.

Policy 19.2.3: Non-Residential Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are encouraged to be mixed use in nature, and allow for residential uses when possible. Further, uses outside of the Site Location Nodes on Corkscrew Road should be limited to minor commercial uses intended to serve community residents.

Policy 19.2.4: By the end of 2001, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that encourage or incentivize mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road.

Policy 19.2.5: With the exception of Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, as may be amended from time to time, Lee County shall discourage retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of service and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.6: By the end of 2001, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that prohibit "detrimental uses", free-standing nightclubs or lounges, or retail uses that require significant outdoor display, storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

Policy 19.2.7: By the end of 2001, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that require Planned Developments which exceed the five year time frame established in the Land Development Code to automatically become vacated. In order to extend, vest or otherwise maintain the original Master Concept Plan, all provisions required by Goal 19 shall be accommodated by the development.

Policy 19.2.8: By the end of 2001, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that require commercial developments within the Estero Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County shall protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County shall encourage higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, and along I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2001, Lee County shall amend the Mixed Planned Development Category to allow for small scale mixed use projects along Corkscrew Road, to allow residential above or in close proximity to retail and service uses.

Policy 19.3.3: By the end of 2001, Lee County shall review, amend or adopt regulations to strengthen buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.4: Lee County shall protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, or the placement of transitional density units along the perimeter.

Policy 19.3.5: No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD.

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2001, Lee County shall review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries shall include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide a 50' vegetative buffer adjacent to the top of bank. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County shall encourage the off-site mitigation of indigenous areas, wetland impacts or wildlife habitat impacts to be provided within the Estero Community Boundaries.
- Lee County shall provide significant incentives (increased density, impact fee reductions, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands, flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resource within the Estero Community.

Policy 19.4.2: Lee County shall focus acquisition efforts on environmentally sensitive lands east of I-75 and along the Estero Bay.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce Wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County shall encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions.

Policy 19.5.1: Lee County shall register groups within the Estero Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, development code amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates.

Policy 19.5.2: Lee County shall require public notice to any "registered" person or landowner within 500', issued upon being found sufficient.

Policy 19.5.3: Lee County shall establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available.

Policy 19.5.4: Lee County shall require that the agent for any planned development request within the Estero Community, conduct one public workshop, or provide one set of submittal information to an established "document clearing house" for public review. The agent shall provide the public workshop or submittal of documentation at least one week prior to the Hearing Examiner meeting.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County shall work with the Estero Community to economically provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities necessary to support the Estero Community as a vibrant urban core.

Policy 19.6.1: Lee County and the Estero Community shall work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Sahdev Property, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of Koreshan State Park into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, attractive fence/walls along US 41, the provision of a "gateway" at US 41 and Corkscrew Road and enhanced pedestrian access.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will adopt regulations that will encourage the protection of historic or culturally significant areas from conversion to residential or commercial uses. This is not intended to prevent ancillary development designed to highlight historic uses, but rather to prohibit the removal of such historic uses.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.5: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

Policy 19.6.6: Lee County will assist the Estero Community in identifying and developing a "village green" that provides opportunities for public gathering, recreation, civic activities, and the distribution of public services, including a post office, license bureau, tax collectors office, police sub-station and or fire station.

Policy 19.6.7: Lee County will work with the Community and specific property owners to evaluate the potential of extending Sandy Land to Williams Avenue to provide for an alternative north/south corridor.

Modifications to current Lee Plan Provisions:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6 1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Vision Statement: Amend the Vision Statement to reflect the Vision Statement developed for the Estero Community.

Proposed Actions for Phase II of the Estero Community Plan:

As a result of the Action Items identified during the Phase I Community Planning Effort, several steps are recommended to the Community for incorporation of the Phase II Community Planning Effort.

These include the following:

1. Evaluate and/or Modify Land Development Code Section 10-416, to consider enhanced landscape requirements for the Estero Community, particularly adjacent to identified road corridors, and between commercial and residential developments.
2. Evaluate and/or Modify Article IV of the Land Development Code to consider enhanced architectural requirements for the Estero Community.
3. Evaluate and/or Modify Chapter 30 of the Land Development Code to provide additional design guidelines for signage within the Estero Community.
4. Evaluate and/or Modify Division 7 of Chapter 34 to provide for enhanced notification of pending development approval hearings, as well as establish a methodology to provide greater information to the public prior to public hearings.
5. Evaluate and/or Modify Section 34-373(a)(6) of the Land Development Code to establish additional submittal requirements for specific land uses.
6. Clarify Section 34-341 of the Land Development Code to require that all commercial developments within the Estero Community be evaluated through the Planned Development process.
7. Evaluate Table 34-934 of the Land Development Code to establish that certain detrimental uses, or uses with significant outdoor storage are discouraged within the Estero Community except at locations currently designated on Map 19 of the Lee Plan.

Proposed Actions for Phase III of the Estero Community Plan:

As a result of the Action Items identified during the Phase I Community Planning Effort, several steps are recommended to the Community for incorporation of the Phase III Community Planning Effort.

These include the following:

1. Adopt a Historic Development Overlay for the historic corridor between US 41 and the Highland Avenue area.
2. Evaluate the potential of extending Sandy Lane to Williams Avenue, and the potential creation of an additional east/west connection road.
3. Prepare the necessary data and analysis to adopt a mixed use Village Overlay district along Corkscrew Road.
4. Evaluate the preservation strategies for targeted acquisition areas east of I-75.

September 28, 2000

Mr. Matt Noble, Senior Planner
Lee County Department of Community Development
1500 Monroe Street
Fort Myers, Florida 33901

**Re: Estero Community Plan
Comprehensive Plan Amendment Documentation**


Dear Matt:

On behalf of the residents and property owners of Estero, I am pleased to submit the preliminary recommendations for the Estero Community Plan. This plan incorporates the vision and input of a wide section of the Estero Community, and is designed to provide significant direction for the future growth within the Community.

I look forward to working with the Lee County Department of Community Development and the Estero residents to fine tune this application as it proceeds as a County initiated amendment. I understand that you have already developed a list of issues that you would like to review, and I will be calling you to schedule a meeting to review these items. Further, I would like to hold one more Public Workshop on Phase I of the Community Plan, and have Lee County take an active role in this interactive process.

In the meantime, if you have any questions, or would like additional documentation on any of the recommendations contained in the Estero Community Plan, please do not hesitate to contact me. Once again, on behalf of the residents of Estero, thank you in advance for your efforts in adopting the plan that outlines the future vision for this growing community.

Sincerely,
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP



Mitchel A. Hutchcraft, ASLA, AICP
Executive Vice President

Cc: (without attachments)
Meg Vencellar, Estero Chamber of Commerce
Eddie Perry, Estero Civic Association
Neal Noethlich, ECCO
Don Eslick, ECCO
Frank Weed, West Bay Club
David Graham, Bonita Bay Properties

Resource Data/Maps

Lee County Department of Community Development



www.lee-county.com

Sections

[Affordable Housing](#)

[Building Services](#)

[Codes and Enforcement](#)

[Comprehensive Planning](#)

[Data Resources](#)

[Environmental Sciences](#)

[Historic Preservation](#)

[Zoning](#)

Other Info

[Applications - Docs - Maps](#)

[Contact Information](#)

[Fees Information](#)

[General Information](#)

[Meeting Agendas](#)

[Questions and Comments](#)

[Related Links](#)

[Reports](#)

[Search This Site](#)

Planning Community of San Carlos/Estero

[Back to Planning Communities Map](#)

| Year | Population |
|-------|------------|
| 1998 | 23,240 |
| 2020* | 43,404 |

* Forecast

| Residential Use by Future Land Use Category | Allocation for Year 2020 | Acreage | |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | | Existing | Available |
| Central Urban (CU) | 15 | 17 | -2 |
| Urban Community (UC) | 1,113 | 715 | 398 |
| Suburban (S) | 2,962 | 2,090 | 872 |
| Outlying Suburban (OS) | 81 | 73 | 8 |
| Industrial Development (ID) | 13 | 10 | 3 |
| University Community (UNC) | 860 | 0 | 860 |

What's New?



| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Rural (R) | 280 | 13 | 267 |
| Wetlands (WL) | 50 | 93 | -43 |
| Total Residential | 5,374 | 3,011 | 2,363 |

| Other Uses | Allocation for Year 2020 | Acreage | |
|------------|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | | Existing | Available |
| Commercial | 2,853 | 353 | 2,500 |
| Industrial | 352 | 181 | 171 |

*Lee County Department of Community Development
Copyright © 2000. All rights reserved.
Last Revised: 08/18/00 02:11 PM*

Residential Estimates


As of December 1999

| Fire District | DWELLING UNITS | | | POPULATION | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------|----------|------------|
| | Total | Permanently Occupied | Seasonally Occupied | Permanent | Seasonal | Functional |
| Alva | 1,169 | 1,006 | 104 | 2,286 | 209 | 2,495 |
| Bayshore | 2,502 | 2,035 | 342 | 4,624 | 683 | 5,307 |
| Boca Grande | 1,143 | 446 | 640 | 1,013 | 1,280 | 2,293 |
| Bonita Springs | 23,047 | 13,073 | 8,822 | 29,701 | 17,644 | 47,345 |
| Burnt Store | 1,214 | 498 | 656 | 1,131 | 1,311 | 2,442 |
| Cabbage Key | 12 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 18 | 23 |
| Cape Coral* | 152 | 95 | 49 | 216 | 99 | 315 |
| Captiva | 1,393 | 324 | 1,000 | 736 | 1,999 | 2,735 |
| Cayo Costa | 18 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 27 | 35 |
| Division of Forestry | 12 | 8 | 3 | 19 | 6 | 25 |
| Estero | 6,815 | 4,484 | 1,990 | 10,188 | 3,980 | 14,168 |
| Fort Myers Beach | <i>Contact the Town of Fort Myer Beach</i> | | | | | |
| Fort Myers Shores | 3,352 | 3,013 | 172 | 6,845 | 344 | 7,188 |
| Fort Myers* | 278 | 242 | 22 | 550 | 44 | 594 |
| Iona McGregor | 29,303 | 21,394 | 6,444 | 48,607 | 12,888 | 61,495 |
| Lehigh Acres | 13,908 | 12,486 | 727 | 28,367 | 1,454 | 29,821 |
| North Fort Myers | 27,054 | 21,110 | 4,591 | 47,962 | 9,183 | 57,145 |
| Pine Island Matlacha | 5,968 | 3,700 | 1,969 | 8,407 | 3,939 | 12,346 |
| San Carlos | 10,147 | 7,102 | 2,537 | 16,136 | 5,075 | 21,211 |
| Sanibel | <i>Contact the City of Sanibel</i> | | | | | |
| South Trail | 18,807 | 14,444 | 3,423 | 32,817 | 6,845 | 39,662 |
| Tice | 7,047 | 6,286 | 409 | 14,282 | 817 | 15,099 |
| Upper Captiva | 225 | 47 | 166 | 107 | 333 | 440 |
| Usppa Island | 117 | 25 | 87 | 56 | 173 | 229 |

Source: Lee County DCD Planning Division Existing Land Use Database

*Figures are for the unincorporated portion of the fire district. Contact the appropriate municipality for their information.


R 20 E R 21 E R 22 E R 23 E R 24 E R 25 E R 26 E R 27 E




- PLANNING COMMUNITIES**
- [Pattern] ALVA- 1
 - [Pattern] CAPE CORAL- 8
 - [Pattern] FORT MYERS SHORE- 4
 - [Pattern] PINE ISLAND/MATLACHA- 18
 - [Pattern] BOCA GRANDE- 2
 - [Pattern] CAPTIVA- 7
 - [Pattern] GATEWAY/AIRPORT- 10
 - [Pattern] SAN CARLOS/ESTERO- 13
 - [Pattern] BONITA SPRINGS- 3
 - [Pattern] DANIELS PARKWAY- 11
 - [Pattern] IONA/MCGREGOR- 12
 - [Pattern] SANIBEL- 14
 - [Pattern] BUCKINGHAM- 20
 - [Pattern] FORT MYERS- 8
 - [Pattern] LEHIGH ACRES- 17
 - [Pattern] SOUTH FORT MYERS- 15
 - [Pattern] BURNT STORE- 5
 - [Pattern] FORT MYERS BEACH- 9
 - [Pattern] NORTH FORT MYERS- 19
 - [Pattern] SOUTHEAST LEE COUNTY- 18

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|--------|
| PROJECT NO. | 80260 | MAPS | 80260 | DATE | 3-1-00 |
| PROJECT NAME | BONITA BAY PROPERTIES, INC. 3451 Bonita Bay Blvd Bonita Springs, FL 34134 | | | | |
| PREPARED BY | VANASSE & DAYLOR, LLP 8270 College Parkway Suite 205 Fort Myers, FL 33910 | | | | |
| SCALE | 1" = 4 MILES | | | | |
| DATE | 3-1-00 | | | | |
| BY | [Signature] | | | | |
| CHECKED BY | [Signature] | | | | |
| APPROVED BY | [Signature] | | | | |
| PROJECT LOCATION | LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA | | | | |
| PLANNING COMMUNITIES | [List of communities] | | | | |

Recommended Focus Area:



Community Boundaries:




NOTES

- 1.) ALICO INTERCHANGE
CASE NOS. 85-11-1
- 2.) THREE OAKS/VILLAGE
CASE NOS. 81-1-1 E
- 3.) PELICAN LANDING

Based on the Estero Fire District Boundaries




Undeveloped Land:




◆ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

Commercial/Residential Interface Zone:



Lee County Planned
Development Map, 1998


Developments of Regional Impact:




Estero Bay and Watershed
Assessment, Prepared by
PBS&J and SFWMD

Vanasse & Daylor, LLP

Community Boundaries:



Based on the Estero Fire District Boundaries



DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTERO AREA


- RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
- COMMERCIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
- INDUSTRIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
- MIXED USE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
- COMMUNITY FACILITIES PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
- PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT
- DEVELOPMENTS PENDING REVIEW



ANNUAL TOTALS for ALL STATIONS


| <u>YEAR</u> | <u>SINGLE FAMILY</u> | <u>DUPLEX</u> | <u>MID RISE</u> | <u>HIGH RISE</u> | <u>MULTI FAMILY</u> | <u>MOBILE HOME</u> | <u>RV</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>Cumulative TOTAL</u> |
|--------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|
| PRESENT | 2,283 | 87 | | | 2,088 | 2,557 | 74 | 7,089 | 7,089 |
| 2000 | 2,847 | 99 | | | 1,913 | 123 | | 4,982 | 12,071 |
| 2001 | 1,233 | 68 | | 72 | 1,648 | 20 | | 3,041 | 15,112 |
| 2002 | 955 | 14 | | | 1,337 | 20 | | 2,326 | 17,438 |
| 2003 | 762 | 14 | 30 | | 971 | 20 | | 1,797 | 19,235 |
| 2004 | 645 | | | | 771 | 20 | | 1,436 | 20,671 |
| 2005 | 523 | | | 75 | 498 | 10 | | 1,106 | 21,777 |
| 2006 | 366 | | | | 620 | | | 986 | 22,763 |
| 2007 | 305 | | | 75 | 594 | | | 974 | 23,737 |
| 2008 | 232 | | | | 444 | | | 676 | 24,413 |
| 2009 | 210 | | | | 443 | | | 653 | 25,066 |
| 2010 | 210 | | | | 442 | | | 652 | 25,718 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 10,571 | 282 | 30 | 222 | 11,769 | 2,770 | 74 | 25,718 | 25,718 |

Existing Commercial Planned Developments & Commercial Nodes:



Lee County Planned Development Map, 1998

R 20 E R 21 E R 22 E R 23 E R 24 E R 25 E R 26 E R 27 E



- PLANNING COMMUNITIES**
- | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| ALVA- 1 | CAPE CORAL- 6 | FORT MYERS SHORE- 4 | PINE ISLAND/MATLACHA- 18 |
| BOCA GRANDE- 2 | CAPTIVA- 7 | GATEWAY/AIRPORT- 10 | SAN CARLOS/ESTERO- 13 |
| BONITA SPRINGS- 3 | DANIELS PARKWAY- 11 | IONA/MCGREGOR- 12 | SANIBEL- 14 |
| BUCKINGHAM- 20 | FORT MYERS- 8 | LEHIGH ACRES- 17 | SOUTH FORT MYERS- 15 |
| BURNT STORE- 5 | FORT MYERS BEACH- 9 | NORTH FORT MYERS- 19 | SOUTHEAST LEE COUNTY- 18 |

V&D
 VANASSE & DAYLOR, LLP
 8270 College Parkway
 Suite 205
 Fort Myers, FL 33918
 Planners • Landscape Architects • Civil Engineers • Environmental Scientists
 Tel: 813-437-4801 • Fax: 813-437-6000 • Email: admin@VANADY.com

PROJECT NO. MAPS
ACID NO. 80260

PROJECT LOCATION:
 BONITA BAY PROPERTIES, INC.
 3451 Bonita Bay Blvd
 Bonita Springs, FL 34134

PREPARED FOR:
 BONITA BAY PROPERTIES, INC.
 3451 Bonita Bay Blvd
 Bonita Springs, FL 34134

DATE:
 5-31-00

SCALE:
 1" = 4 MILES

BY:
 BVM
 PCB

CHECKED BY:
 PCB


DATE:
 5-31-00

PROJECT LOCATION:
 LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA


PLANNING COMMUNITIES

Sheet No. 1 of 1

Recommended Focus Area:




Community Boundaries:



Based on the Estero Fire District Boundaries




Undeveloped Land:




◆ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

Commercial/Residential Interface Zone:




Lee County Planned
Development Map, 1998

Vanasse & Daylor, LLP



Developments of Regional Impact:



Estero Bay and Watershed
Assessment, Prepared by
PBS&J and SFWMD

Approved Development Summary Table

Estero Community Plan Research

| Approved Development Summary in the Estero Community | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Project Name | Resolution # | Hearing Date | Case Number | Total Comm. sq. ft. | Retail sq. ft. | Office sq. ft. | Residential acre | Residential Units | Notes | Strap Number |
| Beasley Broadcasting CPD | Z-88-060 | 4/25/1988 | 88-3-11 DCI | | | | | | Note: 3.77 Public ac. | 28-46-25 |
| Bonita Springs Park #2 (fka Corkscrew Palms RPD) | Z-89-039 | 1/8/1990 | 89-4-25-4-DCI | | | | 0.00 | 187 | | 34-46-25 |
| Breckenridge PH V, VI, VII RPD | Z-96-014 | 4/15/1996 | 95-05-018.02Z 02.01 | | | | 9.83 | 56 | | |
| | PUD-96-006 | 2/2/1996 | 95-05-018.13A 03.01 | | | | | | | |
| | PUD-95-016 | 6/7/1995 | 95-05-018.13A 02.01 | | | | | | | 20-46-25 / 29-46-25 |
| | Z-95-073 | 11/6/1995 | 95-05-018.02Z | | | | | | | 29-46-25 |
| Breckenridge Phase VIII | Z-99-053 | 10/18/1999 | 95-05-018.03Z 01.01 | | | | 19.78 | 160 | | 20-46-25 |
| Breckenridge Prof CPD | PD-94-005 | 3/16/1994 | 91-1-29-DCI-4(a) | 121,000 | 12,500 | 108,500 | | | | 20-46-25 |
| | Z-91-010 | 3/25/1991 | 91-1-29-DCI-4 | | | | | | | 20-46-25 |
| Breckenridge PUD (fka Laguna Woods) | ZAB-85-129 | 9/9/1985 | 82-2-15-DCI | | | | 103.00 | 617 | | 29-46-25 |
| | ZAB-84-194 | 10/15/1984 | 82-2-15-DCI | | | | | | | 29-46-25 |
| | PUD 92-18 | 11/2/1992 | 82-2-15-DCI | | | | | | | 29-46-25 |
| | Z-82-038 | 8/9/1982 | 82-2-15-DCI | | | | | | | 29-46-25 |
| Brooks of Bonita DR/MPD | | | 96-07-030.04z 02.01 | 250,000 | | | 0.00 | 5,200 | | 2,3,9,1-,11-47-25 |
| | | | 96-07-030.03z 02.01 | | | | | | | 2,3,9,10,11-47-25 |
| | Z-97-037 | 8/25/1997 | 96-07-030.04Z | | | | | | | 2,3,9,10,11-47-25 |
| Camargo Trust MPD | Z-97-037 | 8/25/1997 | 96-07-030.04Z | | | | | | | 2,3,9,10,11-47-25 |
| Camargo Trust MPD | Z-98-029 | 6/29/1998 | 97-12-021.03Z | 400,000 | 100,000 | | | | | 33-46-25 |
| Coconut Road MPD | Z-98-075 | 11/16/1998 | 97-12-118.03Z | | | | | 142 | Note: 46.40 ac Mixed Use | 09-47-25 |
| | Z-91-099 | 12/9/1991 | 91-10-1-DCI-1 | | 40,526 | 29,999 | | | Note: Previously Robert Bruce CPD | 09-47-25 |
| Corkscrew Comm Park CPD | Z-86-136 | 1/12/1987 | 86-08-08-DCI | 130,000 | 100,000 | 30,000 | | | | 35-46-25 |
| | Z-90-134 | 1/28/1991 | 90-12-11-DCI-2 | | | | | | | 35-46-25 |
| Corkscrew Crossings CPD | Z-94-050 | 12/5/1994 | 89-5-16-4-DCI-(a) | 187,000 | 187,000 | | | | | 35-46-25 |
| | Z-89-051 | 11/13/1989 | 89-5-16-4-DCI | | | | | | | 35-46-25 |
| Corkscrew Hammocks PUD | ZAB-82-111 | 9/17/1984 | 82-03-43-DCI | | | | 50.00 | 250 | | 34-46-25 |
| | Z-89-59 | 12/11/1989 | 82-3-43-DCI(a) | | | | | | | 34-46-25 |
| | Z-82-111 | 4/22/1982 | 82-3-43-DCI | | | | | | | 34-46-25 |
| Corkscrew Palms CPD | PD-98-069 | 10/13/1998 | 97-08-132.13A 01.01 | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | | | 34-46-25 |
| | Z-98-015 | 5/4/1998 | 97-08-132.03Z | | | | | | | 34-46-25 |
| Corkscrew Road Square CPD | | | 99-11-037.02Z 01.01 | | | 47,800 | | | Note: No information given | 34-46-25 |
| Corkscrew Village Shopping Ctr CPD | | | 96-02-192.02Z 02.01 | 105,000 | | | | | | 33-46-25 |
| | Z-94-69 | 1/11/1995 | 89-01-04-DCI-04(a) | | | | | | | 33-46-25 |
| | Z-89-06A | 4/10/1989 | 89-01-04-DCI-04 | | | | | | | 33-46-25 |
| | Z-89-06 | 2/13/1989 | 89-01-04-DCI-04 | | | | | | | 33-46-25 |
| | PD-96-050 | 9/16/1996 | 96-02-192.13A | | | | | | | 33-46-25 |
| | PD-96-065 | 2/10/1997 | 96-02-192.13A 02.01 | | | | | | | 33-46-25 |
| | Z-96-030 | 7/15/1996 | 96-02-192.02Z | | | | | | | 33-46-25 |
| Corkscrew Woodlands (NW Parcel) RPD | Z-94-047 | 11/21/1994 | 94-10-11-DCI-01 | | | | 20.99 | 120 | | 35-46-25 |
| Corkscrew Woodlands RPD (PH A, B, C, D) | Z-96-023 | 7/15/1996 | 96-02-108.02Z | | | | 34.35 | 200 | | 35-46-25 |
| Corlisco CPD | Z-94-010 | 5/2/1994 | 94-03-22-DCI-01 | 300,000 | 250,000 | 50,000 | | | | 22-46-25 |
| Country Oaks RPD | Z-94-004 | 3/21/1994 | 88-6-9-DCI(a) | | | | 38.36 | 123 | | 22-46-25 |
| | Z-88-154 | 7/11/1988 | 88-6-9 DCI | | | | | | | 22-46-25 |
| Creekside RPD/CPD | Z-94-009 | 5/2/1994 | 94-03-15-DCI-01 | 250,000 | | | 111.48 | 500 | | 27-46-25 |
| Danzi Restaurant CPD | | | 99-10-065.02Z 01.01 | | | | | | Note: No information given | 33-46-25 |
| Estero Interstate Commerce Park CPD | | | 99-08-241.03Z 01.01 | 140,000 | 140,000 | | | | | 35,26-46-25 |
| Estero Lakes East RPD (Spring Ridge) | Z-88-294 | 12/12/1988 | 88-10-12 DCI | | | | 28.90 | 82 | | 34-46-25 |
| | Z-91-29 | 6/10/1991 | 91-3-5-DCI-2 | 24,500 | | | | | | 26-46-25 |
| Goodwill Store Adlt Learning (Polish Cultural) Ctr | Z-91-104 | 1/6/1992 | 91-3-5-DCI-2(a) | | | | | | | 26-46-25 |
| | Z-98-090 | 2/1/1999 | 97-10-261.02Z 02.01 | | | | | | | 26-46-25 |
| | Z-98-003 | 3/17/1998 | 97-10-261.02Z | | | | | | | 26-46-25 |
| Grove Lakes RPD (The Groves) | Z-87-134 | 5/9/1988 | 87-7-6 DCI | | | | 37.10 | 73 | | 27-46-25 |

Estero Community Plan Research

| Project Name | Resolution # | Hearing Date | Case Number | Total Comm. sq. ft. | Retail sq. ft. | Office sq. ft. | Residential acre | Residential Units | Notes | Strap Number | |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------|------|
| Koreshan CPD | Z-99-052 | 10/4/1999 | 99-03-070.03Z 01.01 | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | | | 33-46-25 | |
| Kristen Woods RPD/CPD | Z-98-093 | 3/15/1999 | 98-08-067.03Z | 170,000 | | 170,000 | 0.00 | 220 | | 34-46-25 | |
| Pelican Landing CPD/RPD DRI | PD-96-26 | 6/28/1996 | 95-01-050.13A 02.01 | 775,000 | 300,000 | 475,000 | 697.40 | 4,400 | | MANY | |
| | PD-97-38 | 8/15/1997 | 95-01-050.13A 09.01 | | | | | | | MANY | |
| | PD-97-32 | 7/22/1997 | 95-01-050.13A 08.01 | | | | | | | MANY | |
| | PD-97-20 | 5/9/1997 | 95-01-050.13A 07.01 | | | | | | | MANY | |
| | PD-97-12 | 3/21/1997 | 95-01-050.13A 06.01 | | | | | | | MANY | |
| | PD-96-057 | 1/15/1996 | 95-01-050.13A 05.01 | | | | | | | MANY | |
| | Z-94-014 | 8/29/1994 | 94-04-05-DRI-01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-96-039 | 8/28/1996 | 95-01-050.13A 03.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-97-55 | | 95-01-050.13A 12.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-96-021 | 4/29/1996 | 95-01-050.13A 01.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | Z-97-073 | 11/17/1997 | 95-01-050.04Z 06.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | Z-96-055 | 11/4/1996 | 95-01-050.04Z 05.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | Z-95-062 | 8/16/1995 | 95-01-050.04Z 04.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | Z-95-61 | 9/13/1995 | 95-01-050.04Z 03.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PUD-93-001 | 1/8/1993 | 82-8-15-DCI(B) | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-96-040 | 8/29/1996 | 95-01-050.13A 04.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-98-035 | 5/21/1998 | 95-01-050.13A 15.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | | | 95-01-050.03Z 05.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | Z-99-048 | 10/4/1999 | 95-01-050.04Z 10.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | Z-99-065 | 12/6/1999 | 95-01-050.04Z 09.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | Z-98-066 | 9/21/1998 | 95-01-050.04Z 07.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | FPA-98-095 | 1/10/1999 | 95-01-050.04A 02.02 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | FPA-98-094 | 1/15/1999 | 95-01-050.04A 03.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-97-45 | 11/17/1997 | 95-01-050.13A 10.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-98-070 | 10/12/1998 | 95-01-050.13A 16.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-97-51 | 11/19/1997 | 95-01-050.13A 11.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-98-026/2 | 5/7/1998 | 95-01-050.13A 14.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-98-026/1A | 6/30/1998 | 95-01-050.13A 14.02 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-98-026-2 | 5/7/1998 | 95-01-050.13A 14.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-98-026-1 | 5/6/1998 | 95-01-050.13A 14.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | PD-97-56 | 12/11/1997 | 95-01-050.13A 13.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| | Z-99-024 | 6/21/1999 | 95-01-050.04Z 08.01 | | | | | | | | MANY |
| FPA-98-048 | 7/22/1998 | 95-01-050.04A 01.01 | | | | | | | | MANY | |
| Pelican Pointe RPD/Marsh Landing | PD-98-040 | 6/5/1998 | 95-01-329.13A 03.01 | | | | 120.69 | 404 | | 9816-47-25 | |
| | PD-97-052 | 12/2/1997 | 95-01-329.13A 02.01 | | | | | | | 9816-47-25 | |
| | PD-96-051 | 10/25/1996 | 95-01-329.13A 01.01 | | | | | | | 9816-47-25 | |
| | Z-95-053 | 9/6/1995 | 95-01-329.03Z | | | | | | | 04/09-47-25 | |
| South Estero Commercial Center CPD | PD-96-023 | 5/4/1996 | 96-04-121.02Z 01.01 | 205,000 | | | | | | 33-46-25 | |
| | Z-89-005 | 2/13/1989 | 89-1-3 DCI | | | | | | | 33-46-25 | |
| Spiegel CPD | Z-98-051 | 8/17/1998 | 98-01-161.02Z | | | | | | Note: 9.60 Commercial ac. | 34-46-25 | |
| Stoneybrook (fka Corkscrew Pines) | Z-99-026 | 6/21/1999 | 95-01-033.03Z | 300,000 | 200,000 | 100,000 | 0.00 | 1,840 | | 36-46-25 | |
| | Z-91-86 | 9/23/1991 | 84-04-02-DCI(a) | | | | | | | 36-46-25 | |
| | Z-98-018 | 4/21/1998 | 95-01-033.03Z | | | | | | | 36-46-25 | |
| | ZAB-85-128 | 6/17/1985 | 84-4-2-DCI | | | | | | | 36-46-25 | |
| | Z-92-68 | 3/1/1993 | 84-04-02-DCI(b) | | | | | | | 36-46-25 | |
| The Gardens of Estero (fka Garden Oaks RPD) | | | 98-03-199.02Z 02.01 | 10,000 | | | 69.20 | 692 | | 26-46-25 | |
| | Z-91-105A | 5/4/1992 | 91-10-22-DCI-1(R) | | | | | | | 26-46-25 | |
| | Z-91-105 | 1/6/1992 | 91-10-22-DCI-1 | | | | | | | 26-46-25 | |
| | Z-92-071 | 3/1/1993 | 91-10-22-DCI-1(a) | | | | | | | 26-46-25 | |
| The Vines PUD | Z-92-70 | 4/5/1993 | 84-1-18-DCI(d) | | | | 269.00 | 440 | | | |
| | PUD-90-23 | 12/3/1990 | 84-1-8-DCI(c) | | | | | | | | |
| | Z-89-97 | 12/11/1989 | 84-1-18-DCI(b) | | | | | | | | |
| | Z-88-292 | 11/14/1988 | 84-1-18-DCI(a) | | | | | | | | |
| | ZAB-84-18 | 2/20/1984 | 84-1-18-DCI | | | | | | | | |

Estero Community Plan Research

| Project Name | Resolution # | Hearing Date | Case Number | Total Comm. sq. ft. | Retail sq. ft. | Office sq. ft. | Residential acre | Residential Units | Notes | Strap Number |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------|
| University Lake Village / fka Corlico Villages | PD-98-062 | 9/3/1998 | 98-06-003.13A03.01 | 240,000 | 100,000 | 140,000 | 0.00 | 508 | | 23-46-25 |
| | PD-98-043 | 6/18/1998 | 98-06-003.13A02.01 | | | | | | | 23-46-25 |
| | PD-98-041 | 6/23/1998 | 98-06-003.13A 01.01 | | | | | | | 23-46-25 |
| | Z-93-13 | 5/3/1993 | 86-10-07-DCI (b) | | | | | | | 23-46-25 |
| | Z-90-07 | 2/26/1990 | 86-10-07(a) DCI | | | | | | | 23-46-25 |
| | Z-86-169 | 11/24/1986 | 86-10-07-DCI | | | | | | | 23-46-25 |
| | PD-98-062 | 9/3/1998 | 98-06-003.13A 03.01 | | | | | | | 23-46-25 |
| Villages at Country Creek (aka River's Reach) RPD | PD-94-029 | 10/20/1994 | 86-2-13 DCI(g) | | | | 283.00 | 985 | | 27-46-25 |
| | PD-94-008 | 4/22/1994 | 86-2-13 DCI(f) | | | | | | | 27-46-25 |
| | PD-93-024 | 11/19/1993 | 86-2-13 DCI(e) | | | | | | | 27-46-25 |
| | Z-89-95 | 12/11/1989 | 86-2-13-DCI(b) | | | | | | | 27-46-25 |
| | Z-88-67 | 4/11/1988 | 86-2-13-DCI(a) | | | | | | | 27-46-25 |
| | ZAB-86-34 | 4/21/1986 | 86-2-13 DCI | | | | | | | 27-46-25 |
| Villages of Bernwood MPD | Z-97-039 | 9/15/1997 | 96-06-251.03Z 01.01 | 140,000 | 80,000 | 60,000 | 0.00 | 613 | | 22-46-25 |
| Weeks CPD | Z-94-066 | 4/18/1994 | 94-03-01-DCI-01 | | | | | | Note: 4.54 Commercial ac. | 07-47-25 |
| West Bay Club (fka Estero Pointe RPD) | FPA-98-088 | | 95-06-148.04 02.01 | | 2,500 | | 197.90 | 1,121 | | 05-47-25 |
| | FPA-98-087 | 12/30/1998 | 95-06-148.04 01.01 | | | | | | | |
| | PD-98-003 | 4/10/1998 | 95-06-148.13A 01.01 | | | | | | | |
| | Z-96-005 | 3/18/1996 | 95-06-148.03Z | | | | | | | |
| Williams Place Commercial Center CPD | Z-97-026 | 6/2/1997 | 96-10-300.03Z 01.01 | | | | | | Note: Have copy of resolution, no info. | 04-47-25 |
| Woodside Lakes RPD | Z-90-48 | 7/23/1990 | 86-12-14-DCI(a) | | | | 59.92 | 265 | | 09-47-25 |
| | Z-86-215 | 3/9/1987 | 86-12-14 DCI | | | | | | | 09-47-25 |
| Totals | | | | 3,947,500 | 1,512,526 | 1,411,299 | 2,090.98 | 18,933 | | |

PowerPoint 8/15/00

1 **Estero Community Plan**

South County Regional Library

August 15, 2000

Prepared by:

Vanasse & Daylor, LLP.

2 **Estero Community Plan**

South County Regional Library

August 15, 2000

Prepared by:

Vanasse & Daylor, LLP.

3 **Project Goals**

- ◆ To Assist the Community Establish a Vision for the Future of Estero through the preparation of a Community Plan.
- ◆ Process a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Facilitate the Vision
- ◆ Develop Land Development Code Provisions to Implement the Vision.
- ◆ Create a Community Participation Process that involves the Community in the Review of Projects within the Community.

4 **Description**

- ◆ This "Community Plan" is a result of a grass-roots effort to guide the future development of the Community.
- ◆ The development of the "Community Plan" will begin with the adoption of very broad Goals, Objectives and Policies into the Lee Plan.
- ◆ Future "Community Plan" Steps include additions to the Land Development Code, and master planning efforts.

5 **Procedures**

- ◆ Community Visioning (two workshops)
- ◆ Lee County Identify the Community Plan as a "County Initiated Amendment"
- ◆ Submit Draft Approach for LPA inclusion in list of County Initiated Amendments (August 20)
- ◆ Submit Lee Plan Text Amendment (Sept. 29)
- ◆ Initiate Land Development Code Amendments
- ◆ Prepare Modifications to Regulations

6 **Team/Resources**

- ◆ The Preparation of the Community Plan will incorporate the input and resources of the following parties:
 - Community Master Plan Committee Representatives:
 - Estero Chamber of Commerce - Represented by Meg Venceller
 - ECCO - Represented by Neale Neothlick
 - Development Community - Represented by David Graham
 - Vanasse & Daylor, LLP - Mitch Hutchcraft, ASLA, AICP
 - Planning
 - Landscape Architecture
 - Engineering
 - Computer Graphics
 - Lee County Department of Community Development

7 **Where do we begin?**

We have a lot of work to do.....

In order to help achieve our Goals, the committee has identified 6 key issues to pursue in this initial Amendment process.

- Project Boundaries
- Community Character
- Protection of Natural Resources
- Land Use - Commercial

- Land Use - Residential Uses
- Development Approval Process

We welcome input on other issues, but want to let you know that perhaps they will need to be addressed in future phases of this project.

8 Key Issues:

◆ Project Boundary

- What are the areas that have synergy with the Estero Community?
 - Florida Gulf Coast University
 - San Carlos Park
 - Bonita Springs
- What are the limits of the Estero Community?
 - Fire District
 - Community Planning Boundaries
- What are the areas that we want to initially focus on?
 - US 41 Corridor
 - Corkscrew Road Corridor
 - Three Oaks Parkway Corridor

9 Community Boundaries:

10 Recommended Focus Area:

11 Recommended Focus Area:

12

13

14 Recommended Focus Area:

15 Key Issues:

◆ Community Character:

- Develop a set of standards to guide development within the Estero Community to ensure enhancement of the Vision. These standards may address the following:
 - Landscaping
 - Signage
 - Pedestrian Access
 - Architecture
 - Lighting/Street Furniture

16 Community Character:

17 Key Issues:

◆ Protection of Natural Resources:

- Identify significant natural resources needed to protect the quality of life as well as water management and wildlife areas within the Community.
 - Encourage Protection
 - Develop Incentives
 - Encourage Acquisition

18 Undeveloped Land:

♦ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

19 Priority Wetlands:

♦ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

20 Conservation Strategy Map:

♦ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

21 Conservation Strategy Map:

♦ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

22 Key Issues:

♦ Land Use - Commercial Zones:

- Identify areas appropriate for significant retail zones, "neighborhood" retail villages, and retail free corridors.
 - Consider Existing Land Use Map
 - Consider Existing Commercial Approvals

- Consider Community Character

23 Future Land Use Map – Estero Area

Lee County Future Land Use Map

24 Identified Commercial Nodes

Intersections Meeting Neighborhood or Community Commercial Intersection Criteria

Lee Plan –
Map 18 – Commercial Site Location Standards

25

26

27 Key Issues, Continued

◆ Residential Zones:

- Identify areas suitable for increased density, as well as areas requiring reduced densities due to their proximity to lower intensity uses or environmentally sensitive areas.

28 Residential Zones:

What Form? What Density?

29

30

31 Developments of Regional Impact:

Estero Bay and Watershed
Assessment, Prepared by
FBS&J and SPWMD

32 ☐ Key Issues, Continued

◆ Community Involvement:

- Work with the County to establish a mechanism that provides for and encourages greater public involvement in the formative stages of a Planned Development. This may include the following:
 - Public Workshops prior to the Hearing Examiner
 - Earlier public notification of proposed developments
 - Community Design Review Committee

33 ☐ Technology

◆ This project will incorporate the latest planning data and technology available to ensure an Innovative, Creative and enforceable approach to guiding development within this community.

- USGS and DOT aerials
- Available GIS Planning Tools
- Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment
- Draft Environmental Impact Study
- Current Planning Approvals
- Demographic Analysis
- Lee Plan and Zoning Regulations

34 ☐ Current Status

◆ Comprehensive Plan Amendment

- Complete workshop on 8/15/2000
- LPA Accepts County Initiated Amendments on 8/21/2000
- Complete Recommendations by 9/9/2000
- Review with Committee the week of 9/11/2000
- Present to Community the week of 9/18/2000
- Submit to Lee County 9/29/2000

◆ Initiate Land Development Code Amendments – 10/2/2000

35 ☐ Related Documents

◆ Landscape Guidelines:

- For key corridors, intersections and buffers

◆ Signage:

- Establish guidelines which encourage creative design, while reducing overall size and height.

◆ Lighting/Street Furniture

- Provide guidelines consistent with preferred Community Character.

◆ Additional Design Refinements:

- May include detailed landscaping or site design.

36 ☐ Public Comment and Questions:



Estero Community Plan

South County Regional Library

August 15, 2000

Agenda:

6:30 - Welcome and Introduction

6:45 - Power Point Presentation

7:30 - Public Input & Questions

Prepared by:

Vanasse & Daylor, LLP.

Estero Community Plan

South County Regional Library

August 15, 2000

THANKS TO THE CHAMBER
LEE COUNTY
ECCO

MOST IMPORTANTLY — RESIDENTS


Community Visioning Workshop:

Where Do We Go From Here?

- BRIEF BACKGROUND ON APPROACH
- OVERVIEW OF ISSUES
- TIME FOR Q/A & COMMENTS


Prepared by:

Vanasse & Daylor, LLP.



Project Goals

- ◆ To Assist the Community Establish a Vision for the Future of Estero through the preparation of a Community Plan.
- ◆ Process a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Facilitate the Vision
- ◆ Develop Land Development Code Provisions to Implement the Vision.
- ◆ Create a Community Participation Process that involves the Community in the Review of Projects within the Community.




Description

- ◆ This “Community Plan” is a result of a grass-roots effort to guide the future development of the Community.

TEAM APPROACH

→ PARTICIPATE THROUGH FORUMS QUESTIONNAIRES

- ◆ The development of the “Community Plan” will begin with the adoption of very broad Goals, Objectives and Policies into the Lee Plan.
- ◆ Future “Community Plan” Steps include additions to the Land Development Code, and master planning efforts.




Procedures

- ◆ Community Visioning (two workshops)
- ◆ Lee County Identify the Community Plan as a “County Initiated Amendment”
- ◆ Submit Draft Approach for LPA inclusion in list of County Initiated Amendments (August 20)
- ◆ Submit Lee Plan Text Amendment (Sept. 29)
- ◆ Initiate Land Development Code Amendments
- ◆ Prepare Modifications to Regulations

FOR MORE INFO

Please Contact Diane Wakeman, Vanasse & Daylor, LLP.

Phone Number: 437-4601




Team/Resources

◆ The Preparation of the Community Plan will incorporate the input and resources of the following parties:

- Community Master Plan Committee Representatives:
 - Estero Chamber of Commerce – Represented by Meg Venceller
 - ECCO – Represented by Neale Neothlick
 - Development Community – Represented by David Graham

- Vanasse & Daylor, LLP – Mitch Hutchcraft, ASLA, AICP
 - Planning
 - Landscape Architecture
 - Engineering
 - Computer Graphics

- Lee County Department of Community Development




Where do we begin?

We have a lot of work to do.....

In order to help achieve our Goals, the committee has identified 6 key issues to pursue in this initial Amendment process.

- Project Boundaries
- Community Character
- Protection of Natural Resources
- Land Use - Commercial
- Land Use - Residential Uses
- Development Approval Process

We welcome input on other issues, but want to let you know that perhaps they will need to be addressed in future phases of this project.




Key Issues:


◆ Project Boundary

- What are the areas that have synergy with the Estero Community?
 - Florida Gulf Coast University
 - San Carlos Park
 - Bonita Springs
- What are the limits of the Estero Community?
 - Fire District
 - Community Planning Boundaries
- What are the areas that we want to initially focus on?
 - US 41 Corridor
 - Corkscrew Road Corridor
 - Three Oaks Parkway Corridor


Recommended Focus Area




Recommended Focus Area



Recommended Focus Area:











Key Issues:

◆ Community Character:

- Develop a set of standards to guide development within the Estero Community to ensure enhancement of the Vision. These standards may address the following:
 - Landscaping
 - Signage
 - Pedestrian Access
 - Architecture
 - Lighting/Street Furniture

Community Character:






Key Issues:

◆ Protection of Natural Resources:


- Identify significant natural resources needed to protect the quality of life as well as water management and wildlife areas within the Community.
 - Encourage Protection
 - Develop Incentives
 - Encourage Acquisition

Undeveloped Land:




- ◆ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

Priority Wetlands:




- ◆ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

Conservation Strategy Map:




◆ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD

Conservation Strategy Map:



- ◆ Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment, Prepared by PBS&J and SFWMD




Key Issues:

◆ Land Use - Commercial Zones:

- Identify areas appropriate for significant retail zones, “neighborhood” retail villages, and retail free corridors.
 - Consider Existing Land Use Map
 - Consider Existing Commercial Approvals
 - Consider Community Character


Future Land Use Map – Estero Area




Lee County Future
Land Use Map

Identified Commercial Nodes

- Intersections Meeting Neighborhood or Community Commercial Intersection Criteria





Key Issues, Continued






◆ Residential Zones:

- Identify areas suitable for increased density, as well as areas requiring reduced densities due to their proximity to lower intensity uses or environmentally sensitive areas.

Community Vision


These Key Issues are provided to guide discussion during the Visioning process, not to preclude other appropriate topics.

Residential Zones:




What Form?
What
Density?

Existing Commercial Planned Developments:




Lee County Planned Development Map, 1998

Developments of Regional Impact:



Estero Bay and Watershed
Assessment, Prepared by
PBS&J and SFWMD




Key Issues, Continued

◆ Community Involvement:

- Work with the County to establish a mechanism that provides for and encourages greater public involvement in the formative stages of a Planned Development. This may include the following:
 - Public Workshops prior to the Hearing Examiner
 - Earlier public notification of proposed developments
 - Community Design Review Committee


Community Vision

The Goal is to further the Community Vision through public participation, while encouraging development consistent with the “Vision”.



Technology

- ◆ This project will incorporate the latest planning data and technology available to ensure an Innovative, Creative and enforceable approach to guiding development within this community.
 - USGS and DOT aerials
 - Available GIS Planning Tools
 - Estero Bay and Watershed Assessment
 - Draft Environmental Impact Study
 - Current Planning Approvals
 - Demographic Analysis
 - Lee Plan and Zoning Regulations




Current Status

◆ Comprehensive Plan Amendment

- Complete workshop on 8/15/2000
- LPA Accepts County Initiated Amendments on 8/21/2000
- Complete Recommendations by 9/9/2000
- Review with Committee the week of 9/11/2000
- Present to Community the week of 9/18/2000
- Submit to Lee County 9/29/2000

◆ Initiate Land Development Code Amendments – 10/2/2000



Related Documents

- ◆ Landscape Guidelines:
 - For key corridors, intersections and buffers
- ◆ Signage:
 - Establish guidelines which encourage creative design, while reducing overall size and height.
- ◆ Lighting/Street Furniture
 - Provide guidelines consistent with preferred Community Character.
- ◆ Additional Design Refinements:
 - May include detailed landscaping or site design.

Public Comment and Questions:



PowerPoint 9/19/00

Estero Community Plan

South County Regional Library

September 19, 2000

Agenda:


6:30 - Welcome and Introduction

6:45 - Discussion of Findings

7:30 - Public Input & Questions


Prepared by:

Vanasse & Daylor, LLP.




Meeting Objectives:

- ◆ Review the findings of the Community Input
- ◆ Review Community Boundary Recommendations
- ◆ Review Community Vision
- ◆ Present Consultant Recommendations



Community Input:

- ◆ As part of the Estero Community Plan Community Input, over 500 questionnaires were distributed to the Community.
- ◆ As of September 11, Vanasse & Daylor has received and reviewed over 120 Community Responses:
- ◆ Vanasse & Daylor has also logged additional written input, as well as verbal input from residents and land owners within the Community.



Community Input:

- ◆ Based on this input, the following issues were identified as the most important to the Community.
 - Groundwater Protection/Natural Resources
 - Community Appearance (Landscaping & Signage)
 - Enhance Control on Commercial Development
 - Maintaining a Small Town Feel
 - Improving Public Participation Opportunities
 - Enhancing Community Facilities


Community Input:

FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The question read:


Please rank the following public facilities and services based on your perception of the relative need for improvement.

| RANKING | No Answer | No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | TOTALS |
|---------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | |
| 2 | 16 | 40 | 16 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | 125 |
| 11 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 5 | 125 |
| 1 | 19 | 58 | 22 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 125 |
| 3 | 19 | 17 | 28 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 125 |
| 8 | 22 | 8 | 5 | 18 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 125 |
| 9 | 22 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 5 | | 125 |
| 4 | 23 | 10 | 11 | 19 | 12 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | 125 |
| 10 | 29 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 125 |
| 6 | 23 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 4 | | 125 |
| 12 | 22 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 5 | | 125 |
| 13 | 29 | 1 | 1 | | 8 | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 20 | 8 | 125 |
| 5 | 23 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 125 |
| 7 | 22 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 125 |
| TOTALS | | 288 | 180 | 113 | 110 | 105 | 120 | 93 | 101 | 91 | 81 | 95 | 78 | 76 | 67 | 27 |



Community Input:

- ◆ Some of the significant responses to the Questionnaire are summarized on the following slides.
- ◆ Question 2:
 - What character do you want your community to have in 2010?
 - 46% said Mid-sized City
 - 27% said Small town




Community Input:

◆ Question 4:

- Would you support changes to the signage regulations:
 - 75% said yes – to limit size and color and eliminate billboards

◆ Question 5:

- Would you support changes to the landscape regulations:
 - 82% said yes – to require more buffering and street landscaping




Community Input:

◆ Question 6:

- Would you support changes to the architectural requirements:
 - 90% said yes – limit big box, minimize heights, establish appropriate colors.

◆ Question 11:


- Are there any commercial uses you would encourage?
 - 42% of those saying yes said – small shops
 - 25% of those saying yes said - restaurants



Community Input:

◆ Question 11:


- Are there any commercial uses you would discourage?
 - 21% of those saying yes said – car dealerships
 - 17% of those saying yes said – bars/liquor stores
 - 17% of those saying yes said – strip malls
 - 16% of those saying yes said – regional mall
 - 9% of those saying yes said – fast food restaurants



Community Input:


◆ Question 16:

- What issues do you feel are important to future growth?
 - 34% said – land planning
 - 19% said – water issues
 - 10% said – preservation of history




Population:

- ◆ Based on a survey of existing units, conducted in December of 1999, Estero has 7,089 dwelling units, for an estimated population of 14,178
- ◆ Based on an analysis of approved units within the Core Community Area, it is anticipated that there will be 25,700 dwelling units, and an anticipated population of 38,250 by the year 2010.




Population:


- ◆ Based on the responses provided by the residents, the average population anticipated by the Community in the year 2020 is 30,540 – well below the projected peak season population for the year 2010.



Population Comparison:




NOTE: Planning Community totals include both Estero and San Carlos.



Community Boundaries:

- ◆ In order to accurately evaluate the needs associated with the community, specific boundaries were established:
 - Study Area
 - Community Boundary
 - “Core Development” - This area has been identified to reflect the areas that are the primary focus of this initial Lee Plan Amendment.

Study Area:




NOTES

- 1.) ALICO INTERCHANGE
CASE NOS. 85-11-1
- 2.) THREE OAKS/VILLA
CASE NOS. 81-1-1
- 3.) PELICAN LANDING


Based on a Modified Estero Fire District Boundaries


Community Boundary:



Based on The Estero Fire District Boundaries


Core Development Area:






Vision Statement:

“To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth...Esteros growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging...”



Vision Statement:

“Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses. Additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, street scaping, architectural standards and unified access points...”








Key Recommendations:

◆ Community Character:

- The Community expressed a strong desire to control the appearance of their community through control of landscaping, signage, architecture and commercial development.
 - Landscaping – enhanced streetscaping, buffers
 - Signage – reduced size, height and no billboards
 - Pedestrian Access – enhance along main roads
 - Architecture – control styles, heights and colors
 - Lighting/Street Furniture – establish a style


Community Character:




Community Character:



Community Character:





Key Recommendations:

◆ Commercial Uses:

– Protect Corkscrew Road

- No Tourist Oriented Uses outside of designated nodes
- Encourage Mixed Use
- Improve Landscaping

– Protect Three Oaks

- Prohibit retail outside of designated nodes


– Restrict Uses

- Prohibit tourist oriented uses, detrimental uses and high intensity uses along designated corridors and adjacent to residential.

– Require Planned Development Approval

- Require CPD approvals for all commercial projects
- Require that all Vacated Plan Developments comply with the Estero Community Plan in order to extend or vest the Master Concept Plan.



Commercial Approvals/Corridors:






Lee County
Planned
development
Map, 11/99

DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTERO AREA


Commercial Uses:



Commercial Uses:




Commercial Uses:



Commercial – Mixed Use:






Key Recommendations:

◆ Residential Uses:

- Provide for protection of established communities
 - Distance prohibitions for certain uses
 - Protection of Historic Communities
 - Enhanced Buffering
- Allow for Higher Density at the Appropriate Locations
 - Areas near the University – Primarily on North Three Oaks and Koreshan. Some mixed use residential areas may be permitted along Corkscrew.




Key Recommendations:


◆ Natural Resources:

- Provide enhanced protection for Estero River headwaters.
 - Require floodplain protection plans
 - Increase natural water body buffer requirements
 - Require mitigation within the Estero Community
 - Continue enforcement of Wellfield Protection Ordinance, LCWSA guidelines
- Encourage informational program
 - Encourage Lee County to provide an informational program about the surface and groundwater protection measures that are underway.
- Encourage Acquisition, Preservation and Incentives
 - Encourage Lee County to focus acquisition, preservation and incentive programs in the Estero Bay Drainage Basin.


Key Recommendations:



Key Recommendations: Natural Resources




Key Recommendations:



ADOPTED JULY 13, 1998 BY THE ESTERO BAY AGENCY ON BAY MANAGEMENT


ESTERO BAY WATERSHED LAND CONSERVATION/PRESERVATION STRATEGY MAP



Key Recommendations:

◆ Public Participation:

- Establish Registered Groups to receive public notification.
 - Allows for interested groups and residents to obtain information on any project being evaluated within the Estero Community.
 - Establish an expedited notification process for all projects within the Estero Community.
- Establish a Document “Clearing House”
 - Establish a location in the community where submittals, recommendations and correspondence can be made available during the project evaluation process.
- Encourage Community Workshops
 - Encourage applicants to conduct Community Workshops to present project information to the community prior to the Hearing Examiner process. Workshops or informational packages must be provided at least two weeks prior to the Hearing.



Key Recommendations:

◆ Community Facilities:

– Historic Preservation:


- Encourage cooperation with Koreshan State Park to provide a community gateway and pedestrian access.
- Establish a Historic Development Area in the “Highlands Ave. Community.”

– Recreational Opportunities:

- Cooperate with Lee County in the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park.
- Cooperate with the State of Florida to obtain “passive recreational” uses within the Sahdev Property.


– Community Infrastructure:

- Work with the appropriate entity to attract branch services (post office, tax collector) to the community, as well as encourage the location of additional medical facilities.
- Prepare a Master Plan to identify opportunities for a “Community Green” or town square that connects the park, Corkscrew Road corridor, and other community resources.



Additional Recommendations:

- ◆ Landscape Guidelines:
 - For key corridors, intersections and buffers
- ◆ Signage:
 - Establish guidelines which encourage creative design, while reducing overall size and height.
- ◆ Lighting/Street Furniture
 - Provide guidelines consistent with preferred Community Character.
- ◆ Additional Design Refinements:
 - Evaluate detailed landscaping and site design for Key Areas (Koreshan State Park, Village Green)
 - **Historic Development Area Regulations.**



Current Status



◆ Comprehensive Plan Amendment

- Initial Community Workshop Conducted on 8/15/2000
- LPA Approved County Initiated Amendment on 8/28/2000
- Reviewed Draft Recommendations with Committee on 9/13/2000
- Draft Recommendations Presented to Community 9/19/2000
- Submit Draft Community Plan to the Estero Library on 9/20/2000
- Recommendations Scheduled for Submittal to Lee County on 9/29/2000


◆ Initiate Land Development Code Amendments – 10/2/2000

Identified Commercial Nodes

○ Intersections Meeting Neighborhood or Community Commercial Intersection Criteria



Existing Commercial Planned Developments & Commercial Nodes:



DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTERO AREA

Lee County
Planned
Development
Map, 11/99

Media Clippings

Estero Book

OPINION

Phone: (941) 335-0224 ■ 2442 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Fort Myers, FL 33901-3987

8B WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2000 ***

EDITORIAL BOARD

The News-Press editorials are unsigned. They reflect the opinion of the editorial board.

CAROL HUDLER
President and Publisher
MARTHA CALBIMONTE-HILL
Mailbag Editor
JONATHAN GRAY
Citizen member, East Fort Myers

TERRY EBERLE
Executive Editor
MARK STEPHENS
Asst. Editorial Page Editor
MARY JANE HUNTER
Member Emeritus

RONNIE RAMOS
Managing Editor
DOUG MACGREGOR
Editorial Cartoonist
HARRY O. HENDRY
Citizen member, Fort Myers

GAIL PALME
Editorial Page Editor
TONY GARDIN
Employee mem
MARY ANNE PAK
Citizen member, Fort Myers

A GANNETT NEWSPAPER

EDITORIAL

Koreshan plans look to future

Residents must take strong stand, support foundation

Some old-timers in Estero remember when U.S. 41 was a dirt trail, a swing bridge carried travelers across the Estero River and all was quiet except for the drone of mosquitoes.

Today, U.S. 41 is a bustling four-lane (soon to be six-lane) highway. About all that remains of Florida is lense pine, and palm oasis that is the Koreshan Unity Foundation property at the northeast corner of 41 and Corkscrew Road.

Within 10 years, this community of 9,200 will have 50,000 residents.

It is unreasonable to hope that the Koreshan property would remain untouched as much as the residents might wish it would.

The foundation's 50 acres are under intense development pressure; the land is worth millions and millions of dollars. At the same time, the foundation is under pressure to find a way to keep the Koreshan legacy alive for generations to come who want to learn about these interesting people, pioneers of Estero, all dead now.

The foundation has unveiled a plan to itself develop this unique property into a conference and retreat center in a way that will provide cash flow and preserve the natural and historic treasures on the site.

Nearly half the land will be conservation area. Development will include

the College of Life and associated lodging, shops, a marina for paddle craft and electric boats only and a restaurant.

The foundation even has abandoned its former — and highly unpopular — idea of a pedestrian bridge with pilings in favor of a suspension footbridge.

Architecture will be pioneer "cracker" style.

This plan represents Estero's best hope for keeping this lovely parcel as the shady retreat it has been for 100 years.

Therefore, the plan deserves the residents' support. At the same time, residents need to remain vigilant to ensure that control of the project remains in the hands of the foundation, whose respect for the integrity of the land is shown in the plans.

Community watchdogs need to pledge to monitor the project every step of the way during its expected 10 years-plus buildout; that is the only way to make sure that "Riverplace" takes shape as intended.

This property is the heart of Estero. Properly done, it will set the tone of the community and its unique heritage and set it apart from the often interchangeable and banal communities of Florida.


Residents need to get involved and stay involved. Drop by the Koreshan Museum off Corkscrew Road to see the plans. Ask questions.

The plans' supporters envision the property as the Central Park of Estero. Done right and maintained, it could be just that.

AGENDA 2000



A voice for communities



MAILBAG

Remember to vote in Oct. 3 runoff

Let me tell you up front that my wife is Marilyn Stout. She is running for the Florida House of Representatives, District 74. She is an able, caring public servant and will be your best choice for that position on the ballot Tuesday. Of course, I hope you will vote for her.

More than that, I greatly hope you will vote. When you feel that your vote doesn't count or that you are too busy to vote, remember that some serviceman on some battlefield gave his life to secure your right to vote. That is our heritage. Will you give it up so easily?

You may think that politicians are crooked. Then, study the candidates and vote for the honest ones. You may think that politics is dirty. Then, watch their campaigns and vote for those who don't indulge in dirty tricks.

ANTHONY STOUT
Cape Coral

Education crucial

On the issue I tell my kids is the most important, education, Jeff Kottkamp, candidate for the Florida House of Representatives District 74, outruns his opponent, Mr. Kottkamp attended the local schools my kids and I attended. But more important he attended college and earned his degree, and then went on and also earned a law degree.

As a concerned citizen, I think it's important that elected officials are well-educated and finish what they start. As a concerned parent I know it's important to show our kids that a good education is essential and should be rewarded. I commend everyone who is willing to hold themselves out for election to a public office, but our issues have become

WRITE US

Please limit your letters to 200 words and print your name, address and daytime phone number. You may include a photograph for publication.

Send letters or guest cartoons to:

Mailbag
P.O. Box 10
Fort Myers, FL 33902
Fax: 334-0708

The truth is Grady inherited the mess that took place during Mayor Smith's administration. And it was Grady who foreclosed the properties, one of which (OMNI) is now the site of Miami Heat coach Pat Riley's mega sports, commercial and residential development. The city was near bankruptcy under the administration of the last lawyer who held the mayor's office. We don't need Humphrey, whose law firm filed a multimillion dollar lawsuit against the city. As mayor, Humphrey would get to hire a city attorney and other lawyers he chooses. With huge legal fees at risk, don't look for him to hire O.J. Simpson's defense team to defend his firm's suit against the city. If Humphrey is elected you can look for the taxpayers to pick up the multimillion dollar tab.

JOHN GRADY
Fort Myers

Hooker feedback good

They have referred to his helping them when they visited the office. It is with utmost confidence that I recommend your voting for "Skip" Hooker for tax collector.

FRANK BRYAN M.D.
Fort Myers

Qualified and dedicated

In the recent runoff election for county tax collector, Cathy Curtis garnered the highest number of votes among the four candidates. There is a reason for this: Cathy is a highly qualified candidate, having held public positions requiring expertise in the financial workings of government.

Cathy is dedicated. Since her announcement to seek the office of Lee County tax collector, she has systematically reached out to the large community in an effort to know the residents. She has walked door to door, introduced herself and answered the concerns of voters. If she hasn't gotten to your house yet, know that she is still walking door to door, trying to reach all in the voting area. This has been accomplished on her own time so that the quality of her work in Fort Myers is not compromised.

Cathy Curtis has my vote. I hope she will have yours.
JOHN HALL
Fort Myers

Bob Janes a listener

I hope you will all join me in voting for Bob Janes as our county commissioner for District 1.

He is ethical and honest. In his three terms as mayor of Sanibel, he has developed a reputation for listening to the citizens. This is evidenced by his attendance at Cape Coral political forums. (His opponent frequently

county commissioners to bring a commissioner meeting to Cape Coral at least quarterly.

GEORGE KELLER
Cape Coral

Committed to community

It was an honor to participate in this year's county commission District 1 race. Encouragement to participate came from many long-time friends and leaders in the community. I was fortunate to garner a large amount of support from the community and I am proud of that vote of confidence. I am passionate about Lee County and its constituency, as I am passionate about the success of our community.

I would like to thank all those who supported and helped me in the September primary. Without your loyalty and your friendship I would not have participated in this honorable process.

Now, it is time to look forward, to put the past where it belongs. I would ask that those constituents who supported my campaign, please redirect that energy, that vote, that commitment to my friend Mayor Roger Butler for the county commission District 1 seat.

Mayor Butler has demonstrated commitment to the community. He's a seasoned legislator with proven leadership skills in a large municipality of over 100,000 residents. I encourage you to support him.

BERNIE BRADEN
Cape Coral

To serve and protect

We need a sheriff who is fair and intelligent. A new sheriff will have time to investigate employee complaints and he will not sign a termination form without

Riverplace of Estero
A site plan for the new Koreshan development

SC
FEA
T
Ad
hav
obl

Re:
nowher
an ext
highlig
when i
joins w
The yo
the sto
adu
failure
a victo
Wh
take on
her ow
life in
demon
attitud
witness
ter fee
withou
there is
life if s
and de
The r
have f
and th
deserv
attemp
The
ments
mother
ing. At
didn't
down a
life." T
finding
10 her
sexual
Sharon
the m
preach
she fo
would
she, ur
use pro
This
parent:
worst
childre
to be t
discus:
with a
neglig
course
rebelli
This is
no adu
acted
squel
This
because
one fa
filled
center
view
themse
born f
was at
lmal m
ish to
adopt
10-yea
Then
hands
of the
Adu
ing a
requir
to effe
in the

EDITORIAL

Openness called for in sector plans

Accountability rules need to be followed

Land planner Greg Stuart, who heads one of Lee County's most important land use advisory committees, has made a proposal that is so perfectly reasonable that it is hard to imagine why it has become controversial — unless there is some kind of chicanery going on.

Stuart is chairman of the Local Planning Agency, whose members are appointed by Lee County commissioners. The agency reviews land use planning proposals and issues and makes recommendations to the county commissioners about these issues before the commissioners vote on them.

For example, all proposed changes to Lee County's Comprehensive Land Use Plan must be reviewed first by the Local Planning Agency.

One of the big trends that have emerged recently is that several communities are increasingly dissatisfied with the county's handling of land use issues and they want to develop their own "sector plans," in other words, their own visions for the future land use in their communities.

Pine Island worked a year to develop a sector plan, Estero and Buckingham are working on one and Captiva Island is likely to start forming its own community vision.

These plans are complex to form and will have legal standing as additions to the Lee County comprehensive plan. To put one forward successfully, a community needs both professional planning guidance and the input of all interests in the community. The county commissioners can dedicate public money to pay for some of the costs of preparing such a sector plan.

Stuart, who represents development clients in Estero, became concerned when he realized that there are no rules for these sector planning community groups to follow with regard to disclosure of financial interests

or clients of the individuals involved, no rules about meeting notification and no processes to ensure accountability of the public money spent on these plans.

He expressed these concerns to Lee County planning director Paul O'Connor and the pot of controversy boiled over. Some citizens involved in the Estero sector plan roared that Stuart was simply trying to "derail" the sector plan for the benefit of his own clients.

County Commissioner Ray Judah hotly demanded that the county attorney's office launch an investigation of Stuart.

Stuart admits he has a dog in this fight; he represents the Koreshan Unity Foundation, which wants to develop its property in

Estero. He also publicly disclosed all of his clients in Estero.

All he is asking is that the others involved in the sector

plan disclose theirs, since their actions stand to significantly financially benefit some landowners.

What's wrong with that?

This sector planning process, which will be aided by taxpayer dollars, should have the same accountability that we demand in other areas.

The Local Planning Agency is meeting today and plans to discuss these issues.

We strongly urge members to recommend that sector planning be governed by rules of public accountability.

That includes, at a minimum:

- Public meetings and workshops that are properly noticed.

- All records and correspondence should be kept in a public file, open for inspection.

- Minutes of all meetings and workshops must be kept.

- Identify the lead planner and subcontractors, steering committee members and others in key leadership roles. Insist on client disclosure for professional firms involved and others who may have financial interests affected by the plan.

- File financial statements that show how much public money was received and spent.

AGENDA 2000



Your right to know

BT
©MM
scott@

Estero residents coming together on changes to development code

By CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

The rapid-fire path to a community plan for Estero climaxed Tuesday night with the unveiling of a draft plan before more than 100 people who turned out for a final meeting to offer their input.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a private planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead a community plan, presented his draft, which he must submit to Lee County officials by Sept. 29 if it is to be voted on by county commissioners next year.

The meeting was the second of the summer conducted by Hutchcraft. An initial community plan meeting held in August drew 125 people.

Hutchcraft outlined the main concerns residents expressed at the previous meeting and through questionnaires distributed in August.

The top issue was protecting groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

Hutchcraft said of the more than 120 questionnaires that were returned in time for the draft, residents who wanted to see at least some commercial development said they'd prefer small shops over strip malls.

The general consensus of the community also, according to the returned questionnaires, centered around prohibiting commercial uses such as car lots and bars.

Overall, Hutchcraft said, Estero residents want to be able to influence a community many think has had little successful guidance in the past.

"There seems to be an impression that the community has just leap-frogged with no planned direction," Hutchcraft said.

An objective highlighted in Hutchcraft's presentation was increased public participation in county government.

He included a handful of policies in the first phase of the community plan aimed at integrating residents with the development approval process. The policy included mandating that the county notify groups within Estero of pending ordinance reviews, development code amendments or development approvals.

It also suggests the county establish a document clearing-

The top issue was protecting groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

house in Estero where copies of planning staff and hearing examiner reports would be available for public inspection.

Prior to the meeting, participants received a summary of Hutchcraft's initial community plan draft that highlighted several sections in the plan, including preserving the historical facets of the community and protecting existing residential areas from intense commercial uses. His outline included defining the Estero community as a goal within the Lee Plan, which is a comprehensive blueprint

for the entire county.

After Hutchcraft's presentation, several residents asked him how the community could best preserve resources such as the area's future drinking water supply.

Ellen Peterson, a local environmentalist, gave a bleak forecast for the community's main water bodies.

"I think you're sort of being a little over optimistic to think you're going to protect the Estero River," Peterson said.

Peterson said the community should be concerned about wa-

ter retention, adding that communities near the river send their overflow down the river and into the bay.

"The wells are going dry and they're going dry because the water doesn't get a chance to percolate down," she said.

Arnold Rosenthal told Hutchcraft during the meeting that he'd like to see more emphasis placed on parking lot setbacks and requirements. He said he was satisfied with Hutchcraft's work to this point.

"It's a good first draft given the time that he had," Rosenthal said. "I think we're on the right track."

If the Sept. 29 deadline is met, the county could hold Local Planning Agency hearings before Christmas. Such a timeline would bring any comprehensive plan considerations in front of county commissioners sometime in January.

After that, the plan would be reviewed by the state before a final vote by commissioners in spring 2001.

The Is



In Estero

Amenities Include:

- Gated Entry
- Clubhouse w/Fitness Ce
- 70 Channel Cable Pack
- Lawn Maintenance
- Recreational Lake
- City Water & Sewer
- Tennis, Shuffle Board, E
- Heated Pool & Spa

Another Quality Community by **RONALD L. DAVIS**

MON-SA 1-75 to exit 19

website www.retirenet.com

941-498-1122 • 1

BONITAS Best

Congratulations

REALTY WORLD
BROKER NETWORK

Realty World - Florida is proud to announce the addition of Jason Pavich to our winning team of Realtors.



Jason Pavich
Licensed Realtor

3401 Pelican Landing Pkwy #1 • Bonita Springs
390-0116

21301 S. Tamiami Tr. Ste. #340 • Estero
495-9968

"The Right Agent Makes All The Difference In The World"

Bonita Daily

One We

FREE

Try our newspaper and delivery service. No obligation, no pressure, no charge. The time you wish to subscribe, further down off our regular subscription.

CALL 992-3509 OR

Draft of Estero community plan unveiled; residents want more local control

Wednesday, September 20, 2000

By CHAD GILLIS, Staff Writer

ESTERO — The rapid-fire path to a community plan for Estero climaxed Tuesday night with the unveiling of a draft plan before more than 100 people who turned out for a final meeting to offer their input.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a private planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead a community plan, presented his draft, which he must submit to Lee County officials by Sept. 29 if it is to be voted on by county commissioners next year.

The meeting was the second of the summer conducted by Hutchcraft. An initial community plan meeting held in August drew 125 people.

Hutchcraft outlined the main concerns residents expressed at the previous meeting and through questionnaires distributed in August.

The top issue was protecting groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

Hutchcraft said of the more than 120 questionnaires that were returned in time for the draft, residents who wanted to see at least some commercial development said they'd prefer small shops over strip malls.

The general consensus of the community also, according to the returned questionnaires, centered around prohibiting commercial uses such as car lots and bars.

Overall, Hutchcraft said, Estero residents want to be able to influence a community many think has had little successful guidance in the past.

"There seems to be an impression that the community has just leap-frogged with no planned direction," Hutchcraft said.

An objective highlighted in Hutchcraft's presentation was increased public participation in county government.

He included a handful of policies in the first phase of the community plan aimed at integrating residents with the development approval process. The policy included mandating that the county notify groups within Estero of pending ordinance reviews, development code amendments or development approvals.

It also suggests the county establish a document clearinghouse in Estero where copies of planning staff and hearing examiner reports would be available for public inspection.

Prior to the meeting, participants received a summary of Hutchcraft's initial community plan draft that highlighted

several sections in the plan, including preserving the historical facets of the community and protecting existing residential areas from intense commercial uses. His outline included defining the Estero community as a goal within the Lee Plan, which is a comprehensive blueprint for the entire county.

After Hutchcraft's presentation, several residents asked him how the community could best preserve resources such as the area's future drinking water supply.

Ellen Peterson, a local environmentalist, gave a bleak forecast for the community's main water bodies.

"I think you're sort of being a little over optimistic to think you're going to protect the Estero River," Peterson said.

Peterson said the community should be concerned about water retention, adding that communities near the river send their overflow down the river and into the bay.

"The wells are going dry and they're going dry because the water doesn't get a chance to percolate down," she said.

Arnold Rosenthal told Hutchcraft during the meeting that he'd like to see more emphasis placed on parking lot setbacks and requirements. He said he was satisfied with Hutchcraft's work to this point.

"It's a good first draft given the time that he had," Rosenthal said. "I think we're on the right track."

If the Sept. 29 deadline is met, the county could hold Local Planning Agency hearings before Christmas. Such a timeline would bring any comprehensive plan considerations in front of county commissioners sometime in January.

After that, the plan would be reviewed by the state before a final vote by commissioners in spring 2001.

 [E-mail this story to a friend.](#)

 [Format this story for printing.](#)

 [Fax this story for free.](#)

 [Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)

Navigation:

[Go to today's Bonita section front](#)

[Go to our 7-day Bonita archive](#)

[Go to another section...](#) 

Also in this week's Bonita section:

[Bonita City Council: City seeks to ban roadside car sales](#)

[Bonita painter pays tribute to mother's art, life in new book](#)

[Collier records three killings in a week](#)

[Draft of Estero community plan unveiled; residents want more local control](#)

[Estero Fire Board: Seventeen percent raise for fire chief called 'a bit much'](#)

[Fort Myers woman in critical condition after Monday evening Alico Road crash](#)

[Kay Smith: Republican Women open season with Arbor Trace luncheon](#)

[Lee Commission: Judah fails in bid to remove TDC board member](#)

[Lee Commission: Property tax rate could be lower than last year's](#)

[NCH offers free peripheral vascular disease screenings Thursday](#)

[Official tally shows 59 percent of Lee County residents returned census forms](#)

[Police Beat: Naples, Collier County](#)

[Space shuttle's reentry may cause early morning sonic boom over SW Florida](#)

[Suspect in smash-and-grab burglaries arrested in Pennsylvania](#)

Feedback:

[E-mail the naplesnews.com staff](#)

[Write a letter to the editor](#)

Estero residents get glimpse of community plan

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

ESTERO — Estero residents finally got a glimpse of the layer of protection they hope will stop developments they feel do not belong in their community.

More than 150 residents came to hear what their community plan will entail Tuesday night at the Corkscrew Woodlands Clubhouse.

A community plan is a way for residents to determine what their community will look like in the future. In Estero residents have been upset with recent development approvals such as a proposed Sam Galloway car dealership and the county's use of "bubble plans" that allow a wide variety of commercial uses.

Mitch Hutchcraft, the consultant hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to craft the community's vision, said the plan's preliminary draft incorporated the responses of more than 150 questionnaires handed out to Estero residents.

Hutchcraft said the first task in developing the plan was writing a vision statement for Estero. The statement calls for embracing Estero's historic heritage, carefully planning for future growth as a village and establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment.

Hutchcraft said once Estero's vision statement was developed, key community issues became the focus of the plan. They were:

- Community character — proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage and the location and type of certain

land uses.

- Residential land uses — maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment.

- Commercial land uses — limit tourist-oriented uses, detrimental uses such as adult entertainment, free-standing bars and liquor stores, and limit high intensity uses along specific corridors.

- Natural resources — protect groundwater resources and wetlands.

- Public participation — become more involved in the development approval process.

Hutchcraft also said beginning today, a draft of the plan will be available for all Estero residents to read through at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway.

Most residents attending the meeting were pleased with what they heard.

"I don't think we need a city status to achieve the goals everyone is talking about," said resident Jan Schneider.

Resident Doyle Moeller, 55, said he thinks the community plan will allow residents to keep Estero the way it is.

"It's a nice, clean community and I'd like to see it stay that way," Moeller said. "That the reason I moved here."

The recommendations and plan will be submitted to the county Sept. 29 for inclusion in the Lee Plan's amendment cycle.

— Contact Mark S. Krzos at mkrzos@news-press.com or 992-1345.

Man gets

Prosecutor says cases difficult because of 'witness problems'

By PETER FRANCESCHINA
The News-Press

A 24-year-old Fort Myers man was sentenced to 15 years in prison Tuesday for two killings in two drug deals gone bad.

Henry Florence accepted a plea agreement in the two cases rife with prosecution problems. He pleaded no contest to manslaughter for hitting a North Fort Myers man in the head with a wrench. He also pleaded no contest to second-degree murder for shooting an east Fort Myers man.

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA DIGEST

ADMINISTRATOR NAMED: Florida Gulf Coast University has named Jetta Glover its minority business enterprise coordinator.

She will be responsible for the FGCU program that encourages the purchase of goods and services from small and minority-owned businesses.

Glover, a lifelong Fort Myers resident, earned a bachelor's degree in business administration from the University of South Florida and a master's degree in education from Florida Atlantic University.

— The News-Press



WE SMELL
I like Fresh-Cu

P
a
ir
a
F
w
of
th
Pr
Pr
w
cr
m
in
w
so
Pr

N
R
'd
to

I
Bri
wa
lun
?
rur
Gu
Mc
ing
F
pay
dor
a r
She
I
Par
cha

Bonita | Bonita Daily News

✉ 📄 📞 🔍 Bonita front | Bonita archive | help

Estero residents race to complete community development plan

Sunday, September 10, 2000



By CHAD GILLIS, Staff Writer

ESTERO – With less than three weeks before the deadline for Estero residents to submit a community development plan, interest in defining what Estero will look like when it grows up has never been higher.

Estero is racing the clock to beat a Sept. 29 deadline for proposed changes to the county's growth-management plan. Estero residents want to create a set of development guidelines unique to their community, one of the fastest-growing areas in Southwest Florida.

This week promises to be particularly busy, with several community associations holding a variety of meetings aimed at meeting that deadline.

- On Tuesday, the Estero Citizens Community Organization is meeting with Lee County Community Development officials to go over the inner working of a community plan and how the plan, if eventually approved by commissioners, will guide future development. The meeting will be at 1 p.m. at Riverwoods Plantation.
- On Thursday morning, Mitch Hutchcraft, a planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead a community plan, is meeting with an advisory committee made of various Estero residents to discuss a draft form of the plan Hutchcraft plans to submit to the public at a Sept. 19 meeting.
- On Thursday afternoon, the Estero Historical Society is hosting a



lecture of sorts at the South County Regional Library at 2:30 p.m. with two professors from Florida Gulf Coast University discussing community development.

The issue of controlling growth has taken a front seat in the Estero community over the last six months or so. Residents from various neighborhoods have continually expressed a desire to better manage a development boom in Estero that some say is threatening their tranquil lifestyle in a community that consists mostly of retirees and winter residents.

Hutchcraft said as the pending deadline approaches, a more well-rounded cross section of the community is giving input on how Estero should grow.

He said Estero will definitely submit a community plan to the county by the Sept. 29 deadline and continue working on a more specific plan during the upcoming year.

"I think the big goal is to identify the main key issues we can get a consensus on," Hutchcraft said. "There's a lot of issues that we can't get a consensus on and we'll have to wait on those."



One problem, he said, could be unrealistic expectations by some Estero residents who either want to stop growth altogether or adopt a community plan that will address all facets of development by the end of this month.

Barbara Akins, spokesperson for the Estero Citizens Community Organization, agreed with Hutchcraft that more and more people throughout the community are becoming intrigued with the idea of giving Estero its own unique development guidelines.

She said the main focus between now and the Sept. 29 deadline, and for next year's phase of the community plan as well, is getting useful information out to the community.

"We're doing an education process as we go through this so we totally understand how the process (of a community plan) works," Akins said. "We are excited that people want to be more involved in the process because the more input you have the better representation you have."

The newest organization to get involved in planning for the future of Estero is the historical society.



FGCU professor Victoria Dimidjian is scheduled to talk to members of the Estero Historical Society and others at a Thursday afternoon meeting on community development. The meeting is open to the public.

Society president Mimi Straub said the discussion will focus on melding a community that has roots extending more than 100 years with modern growth.

"We need to take a look at what good is happening in this community but also safeguard against what is bad," Straub said.

Straub said Estero is desperately in need of its own identity, a viewpoint shared by many in the community. She said she has been surprised that more residents haven't gotten involved in the community planning process.

"You must be interested in your community and show up at these community development meetings and participate," she said.

If Estero meets the Sept. 29 deadline, the county could hold Local Planning Agency hearings before Christmas. Such a timeline would bring any comprehensive plan considerations in front of county commissioners sometime in January.

After that, the plan would be reviewed by the state before being adopted by the county during the spring of 2001.

 [E-mail this story to a friend.](#)

 [Format this story for printing.](#)

 [Fax this story for free.](#)

 [Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)

Navigation:

[Go to today's Bonita section front](#)
[Go to our 7-day Bonita archive](#)



Also in this week's Bonita section:

- [Bonita civic group to host candidates forum on Sept. 28](#)
- [Bonita considers plan to allow business to open with conditional permits](#)
- [Collier officials propose making Livingston Road six lanes](#)
- [Edsall proposes creating committees, but some Bonita council members say ...](#)
- [Former Lee schools official says he isn't the only one to blame for ...](#)
- [International College: In a time of specialization, a liberal arts alternative](#)
- [International College: New campus makes its debut for students today](#)
- [Kay Smith: Utility's employees now reading water meters](#)

INTERNET'S GUIDE TO THE INTERNET

Internet Commerce Forum 2000



Postcards:

Send an electronic postcard to somebody you know.

Coupons:



Save at local area businesses.

Advertise...

...on the Internet! Find out our rates and details.

Subscribe:

Get the print edition of the Daily News delivered to your door.

Few residents return growth questionnaires

Consultant preparing vision of the future for Estero planning

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

ESTERO — Buildings are coming up quickly in Estero, but residents aren't acting as fast to voice their opinions on development.

The deadline was Wednesday for questionnaires that will help a consultant formulate the community's vision and implement a community plan. So far, only 58 have been submitted.

Residents have been upset with recent development approvals, such as a proposed arm Galloway car dealership that was later withdrawn after residents protested, and the county's use of "bubble plans" to allow a wide variety of commercial uses. They claim they have little say about the appearance of their community and decided the best way to get unlimited development is by drafting their own community plan.

Lee County has agreed to help fund Estero's community plan. The county agreed to spend \$6,250 for the first phase and match funds up to \$25,000 for the second phase of the plan. Mitch Hutchcraft, the consultant hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to craft the community's vision, said the questionnaires have been coming in slowly.

"We probably got 40 responses — we were hoping for a lot more than that," Hutchcraft said Wednesday morning. By late afternoon, other 18 completed questionnaires were turned in.

During the past two weeks, Estero organizations and residents have been handing out a question form seeking opinions on what Estero residents

INFORMATION

■ Estero residents should mail their completed questionnaires as soon as possible.

■ Mail them to Diane Wakeman, administrative coordinator, Vanasse & Daylor, LLP, 12730 New Brittany Blvd., Suite 600, Fort Myers, FL 33907.

■ For more information on the questionnaires, call 437-4801.

want the community to look like in 20 years. The form also includes questions about the community's character, residential and commercial development and the ranking of services in greatest need of improvement.

The questionnaires were first circulated Aug. 15 during a public meeting discussing the community plan. The turnaround time on the questionnaires is so short because Hutchcraft has to incorporate the thoughts of the residents into the plan by Sept. 29 for inclusion in the Lee growth plan.

"We handed out 150 that night and made another 150," a disappointed Hutchcraft said. "We'll still accept more — the cutoff was to encourage people to get them to us quickly."

Hutchcraft said late submissions will be included in the plan provided they're in by late next week.

Of the responses turned in so far, Hutchcraft said opinions are all over the board.

"There's a bunch of people with strong opinions in a whole bunch of different directions," Hutchcraft said.

Hutchcraft said retail-commercial development seems to

See SECTOR / 4

LEARNING ANOTHER LANGUAGE



TERRY ALLEN WILLIAMS/TI

Anastasia Zhilko, 18, who is from Russia, studies English with the help of a computer and headphones morning while engaged in the English Immersion program at International College in Naples.

Classes draw attendees from around the globe

International College teaches English course

By JENNIFER BOOTH REED
The News-Press

NAPLES — For the past 15 weeks, International College has played host to a Slovakian government official, a German concertmaster, a Cuban banker and a Colombian dentist who came to Naples to study English.

Twenty adults from Europe, Asia and South America arrived almost four months ago for an intensive language program at the private college's American English Center. They studied six hours a day, four days a week. Today, they will receive certificates of completion.

"I need English because it's very important for my job," said Liz Carolina Sarcos, a Venezuelan electrical engineer. "I work with

INFORMATION

■ Call International College at 774-7200.

American people all the time. We do big projects for oil companies. They need to speak to me, and they don't speak Spanish."

Students, ranging in age from their 20s to 60s, come from an array of backgrounds and professions. Marta Castano, 36, is a Colombian dentist. Anton Sikuta, 50, is a German violinist who moved to Naples with his American wife a year ago. Soo Hak Lee, 25, is a Korean architect who wants to continue his studies in an American university. Peter Baco, 55, is a Slovakian parliament member and former minister of agriculture who needs English for his government work.

"Slovakia is in the middle of

Europe and wants to be of the European Union. All in Europe. Baco, who returned Wednesday. "I have a dependent of my translation."

Baco learned of International College's program from who moved to Naples ago. Other students learn through the Internet guides.

The American English Center was established six years ago because officials saw the international population.

"This is the only program between Miami and Naples," said Roy Lash, who runs the program. "With Naples as an international city, we saw a need."

The program is in its second round. During the tour enrollment doubles to:

See CQ

Bus cameras proposed to monitor Collier students' behavior

Fort Myers campus. College officials said the American English Center will become more accessible to Lee County foreign visitors and residents when the Naples campus moves to Immokalee Road in North Naples next month.

Students said the class was tough, although many of them had climbed from its lowest level to its

with the speakers were still difficult.

"I cannot understand well out on the street. It is hard," Sarcos said.

The work was worth it, they said.

"It's becoming a global language," said Lee, the architect.

— Contact Jennifer Booth Reed at jreed@news-press.com or 992-1345.

were upset about skyrocketing health insurance costs. Although school district employees get full coverage, they need to pay for family members. In some cases, teachers will pay an additional \$2,000 a year for their family's health care. Rates jumped this year

tract also finalizes a new teacher assessment system that will require teachers to show improvement in 12 areas and keep portfolios of their work.

— Contact Jennifer Booth Reed at jreed@news-press.com or 992-1345.

1515
Nap
Schc
597-4
Nort
MId
1100.

SECTOR: Response small

From Page 1

the greatest concern among Estero residents.

"It's perceived to have the biggest impact on people's lifestyles," Hutchcraft said. "The goal is to make retail more appropriately located. We don't want a big strip of typical convenience retail up and down Corkscrew Road. We want to direct retail to a more central location."

Meg Venceller, chairwoman of the Estero Civic Association, agrees. Venceller, who turned in her questionnaire, said residents support retail that will benefit the Estero community, such as a bakery, beauty salon or gourmet coffee or flower shop. "Residents would support certain types of retail provided that it meets the community's needs," she said.

Bob Kinney, 75, a Corkscrew Woodlands resident who also turned in his questionnaire, said Estero needs more services that will benefit the residents.

"A lot of people I know don't want to see more fast-food restaurants," Kinney said. "The things people want are the things they need, like dentists and health centers — things that they now have to go up to Fort Myers to get."

Hutchcraft said the vision of the

community also varies. "It ranges from a sleepy residential community to a true village," he said.

Frank Weed, president of the West Bay Club and also a resident, said he has yet to fill out his questionnaire, but did say the plan is controlled growth.

"We really have an opportunity to create a secret garden and create something special," Weed said. "The issue is to control growth for all — and see it done responsibly."

Venceller expects the result of the questionnaires will reflect what the residents envision for their community.

"I hope the response is very large," said Neal Noethlich, chairman of the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization. "We gave out a lot of questionnaires — our group has circulated a number of them."

Noethlich, who submitted his questionnaire, said he also hopes there is a wide cross-section of views.

"If people sat down and thought about what they want Estero to be like, look like and feel like — that's the most we can hope for," Noethlich said.

— Contact Mark S. Krzos at mkrzos@news-press.com or 992-1345.

Golf Safari Mini Golf

Bonita Beach is directly south of Ft. Myers Beach. Just off Estero Blvd. south (becomes Bonita Beach Rd.) Golf Safari is on your right just past Vanderbilt Beach Drive.

- Convenient from Ft. Myers Beach
- Ride the Trolley for only 25¢

Family Fun

18 Hole Miniature Golf

3775 Bonita Beach Rd.
Bonita Springs
1/2 Mile West of US 41
Open 7 Days 10AM-10PM
947-1377

\$1 OFF

each player in your group is in this coupon

EXPERIENCE OUR NEWLY REMODELED STATE OF THE ART SPA...

SPA

ULTIMATE INDULGENCE
formerly
Kny Williams & Associates

Professional Therapeutic Massages

Spa Treatments

Facials

Indoor Tanning

941.263.1664

4910 Tamiami Trail N.
Suite 200
Naples, Florida 34103.

Absorb®
Provides maximum heel and foot shock absorbency while resisting compression.

Dunham DIVISION OF **new balance**

BOOTMAKERS 1885

Ruggards®

4500: 3-Eyelet Boat Shoe

| AVAILABLE IN WIDTHS | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| B | 7-12, 13, 14, 15, 16 |
| D | 7-12, 13, 14, 15, 16 |
| 2E | 7-12, 13, 14, 15, 16 |
| 4E | 7-12, 13, 14, 15, 16 |

NEW

Also Women's Sizes

SHOES THAT FIT

Marketplace • Pelican Bay • 9799 N. Tamiami Tr. • Naples
Southwest corner of Vanderbilt Beach Rd. & 41 • (Albertson & SteinMart)
Mon. - Fri. 10-6 • Thurs. Even. Till 8 PM • Sat. 10-4 • Closed Sun 596-8788

CAR TROUBLES? DUE FOR SERVICE?

LEXTECH Automotive, Inc.

Can SOLVE Your Problems!

SPECIALIZING IN
LEXUS, TOYOTA
AND OTHER FINE
AUTOMOBILES!

- Full Service and Repair Facility
- A/C and Climate Control Systems
- ABS Brake Specialists
- State-Of-The-Art Computer Diagnostics For Today's High-Tech Cars
- Factory Trained ASE Master Technicians

27563 OLD 41 ROAD
BONITA SPRINGS, FL 34135
1/4 mile North of Bonita Beach Road
CALL 495-AUTO (2885)
MON-FRI 7:30 to 5:30, SAT 8:00 to 5:00

Bonita & Collier

THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 2000

INSIDE: Around greater Bonita 2 ■ School notes 3 ■ Sports 3

Estero standards outlined

Residents' group details growth plan

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

ESTERO — A group called the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization has outlined what they think Estero should look like in the future.

They want standards for signs, architecture and landscape. They also want commercial corridors separated from parks and residential areas.

Such standards, said the

group's chairman, Neal Noethlich, will ensure that Estero maintains its residential feel.

The idea to create a community plan came after some Estero residents were angered at developments approved by county commissioners.

Residents have been upset with recent development approvals such as a proposed car dealership and the county's use of "bubble plans" that allow a wide variety of commercial uses. They claim they have little say about the appearance of their community and decid-

ed the best way to fight unlimited development is by drafting their own community plan.

The plan would enable residents to decide what their community looks like.

But not all residents or developers in the community of 5,532 agree with the group's wish list.

Frank Weed, president of the West Bay Club, said while he thinks the group is responsible and agreed with some of what it wants, he is concerned about several items on the wish list.


Weed said he took particular interest in items that

dealt with the development approval process and architectural standards.

"What we're hoping for is that these ideas will permeate the (community) plan and the Land Development Code," Noethlich said of his group's ideas. "We're proud of this document and we don't consider it to be knee-jerk — some people might."

Weed said the group's recommendation to have the applicant provide specific intended land use for a project — getting rid of bubble plans — and the intended

See PLAN / 4



CLINT KRAUSE/The News-Press

COLORFUL PLACE: Iguana Mia general manager Todd Harrison in front of a colorful wall at the Bonita restaurant. Such vibrant colors might not be acceptable in Estero's future building plans.

Bonita | Bonita Daily News

✉ 📄 📞 🔍 Bonita front | Bonita archive | help



Estero residents offer input on plan for controlling community's growth

Wednesday, August 16, 2000

By CHAD GILLIS, Staff Writer

ESTERO – More than 100 Estero residents gathered Tuesday night to offer their input on how the community can control and plan for growth in the face of mounting development pressures.

The meeting, at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway, was the first of two scheduled by private planner Mitch Hutchcraft. Hutchcraft was hired by the Estero Civic Association and Estero Chamber of Commerce to help residents draft a community development plan that could be implemented by Lee County commissioners within the next year.

Hutchcraft outlined key issues, such as identifying the community's boundaries and where commercial and residential development should be located, to a crowd with varied and often clashing opinions.

He also said Estero residents could hold public workshops prior to hearing examiner meetings to offer input to developers wanting to build in the area.

"I think they're tired of being subjected to 4 1/2 blind men ... When do the citizens really get to input?"








— Norm Lukes

In the past, rezoning cases have disturbed many residents to the point they began considering annexing into Bonita Springs or incorporating.

The latest momentum for the community has been to form a community plan.


Hutchcraft estimated the community plan project would take between 18 and 24 months to complete.

Several residents were thrilled about the idea of forming a unique development plan for a community that is expected to go from about




9,000 residents to 40,000 or more within the next decade.


"This is probably the most exciting thing that's happened since the Koreshans came to town," said Estero resident Cas Obie. He added that he thinks residents should work with developers to identify areas targeted for high and low density.



Other residents, feeling Hutchcraft was siding with the development community, pleaded with the planner to come up with more effective means of dealing with county government.




"I think they're tired of being subjected to 4 1/2 blind men," said Norm Lukes referring to the half as Lee County Commissioner Ray Judah, who is often the lone dissenting voice during controversial rezoning cases. "... When do the citizens really get to input?"




Lukes said Estero is a community with its own mind and that it needs no direction from government officials in Fort Myers.

Still other residents disagreed on where to put commercial developments.



Those who live along Three Oaks Parkway said Corkscrew Road should be a commercial corridor, while residents on Corkscrew said high-density development should go on Three Oaks.



Some residents said a moratorium is the only way to effectively slow growth enough to get a handle on the community.

Hutchcraft responded to many of the disagreements by saying residents, as well as local developers, need to work together if a community plan is going to get the thumbs up from Lee County commissioners.

Next on Hutchcraft's agenda is to submit a draft of the community plan to the Local Planning Agency near the end of the month. After that a second public meeting will be held for further input in mid September before the plan is submitted to the county on or before Sept. 29.



 [E-mail this story to a friend.](#)

 [Format this story for printing.](#)

 [Fax this story for free.](#)

 [Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)

Session to tackle controlling Estero growth

Input being sought at Aug. 15 meeting

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

ESTERO — Estero community leaders are beginning to form a plan to control development.

At 6:30 p.m. on Aug. 15 in the South County Regional Library, Estero residents will have a chance to help create a vision for their community's development.

Residents will be joined by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, the Estero Civic Association, area planners, developers and environmentalists to establish a community vision.

The intent of the workshop is to solicit input, identify key community issues and develop a consensus on implementing the community's vision.

A consultant already has been hired by the Chamber, and officials hope the county will pay for the first phase

of the study. "We're in an area with a lot of undeveloped land, so we have a wonderful opportunity to set the standards," said Meg Venceller, chairwoman of the chamber and the civic association.

Frank Weed, president of the West Bay Club, agreed. "The key area we're interested in is that the remainder of this area is done in a high-quality manner," he said. "We don't want (Estero) to be honky-tonk."

Weed said his vision for

Estero is something between Tampa's Hyde Park and Naples' Fifth Avenue.

"No one wants to see gas station after gas station on the roadway," he said. "We don't want to see excessive development."

Venceller said in developing a community plan, residents can dictate future architectural and landscaping requirements for all new developments.

See SECTOR / 3

SECTOR: Deadline looms

From Page 1

"We have a vision of Estero," Venceller said. "We want people to know they're in Estero, that it is an aesthetically pleasing place, that we do have standards."

There is a problem, though.

Venceller said the master plan must be completed before Sept. 29 — the deadline for submitting amendments to the Lee County Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

To meet that deadline, Venceller said after the Aug. 15 meeting, planning firm Vanasse & Daylor will compile resident comments, begin working with county officials and prepare the language for the amendment to the Lee Plan.

Another public meeting will be in September, before the deadline.

"In September, we'll say, 'This is what we're going to present,'" Venceller said.

David Graham, vice president of planning and development for Bonita Bay Properties, said he views the plan as benefitting everyone in the Estero area.

"To me, it's the reason most areas incorporate — to control their own process," he said.

Paul O'Connor, the county's director of planning, said community plans have to incorporate all of the residents' concerns.

"If you have a one-sided plan, there's no way it'll get county approval," O'Connor said.

Neal Noethlich, chairman of the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, agreed.

"It has to be a broad-based formation," he said. "We're eager and willing to do that."

O'Connor said Alva tried to have a community plan approved,

but because it failed to address the concerns of people with development potential "it died on the vine."

Funding for the creation of the Estero plan could come from the county. Venceller wrote to Lee County Commission Chairman John Albion on July 26 asking the county to pay for the first phase of the Estero plan.

Albion said he supports county involvement in the plan and hopes commissioners approve the \$6,250 cost to have Vanasse & Daylor complete the plan by the deadline date.

"In the past, the county has provided some seed money for developing sector plans," said Mary Gibbs, the county's community development director.


Gibbs said the county has provided funds for the development of sector plans for Pine Island and Fort Myers Beach.

O'Connor said the county will discuss its policy toward planning studies Monday at its next management meeting.

"We'll look at funding and personnel," O'Connor said. "Things like how much is being spent? Is it being spent properly? I need direction to the board."

Venceller said phase two of the Estero plan, where certain development criteria are targeted and included in the plan, is expected to cost between \$10,000 and \$15,000. "The chamber would pay a portion of that as well as the county," she said.

— Contact Mark S. Krzos at mkrzos@news-press.com or 992-1345.



CLINT KRAUSE/The News-Press

By cranes Thursday, the Hyatt Regency Hotel takes shape on Coconut Road west of completed in October 2001.

Industry briefed on environmental limits

control development in wetlands. "What are we buying?" he asked rhetorically at the "In the Trenches of Development" conference presented by the Building Industry Association at the Bonita Club house in Bonita. He had kind words for the Corps as well, noting the latest revision of the agency's proposed environmental Impact Statement, released Aug. 2, is better than the original. "The use of response to the development community," he said, "is pulled back from the egregious of their" that limit how much can occur, but the environmentally sensitive eastern part of south Lee and Collier counties. The EIS affects 1,556

square miles. Corps officials have been studying environmental issues there — including the status of the endangered Florida panther — for four years as part of a process spurred by the creation of Florida Gulf Coast University in the headwaters of the Estero River.



ASMUS

Dealing with environmental regulations of growth was the theme of the conference, and speakers said developers are facing the same issues all over the country. The Corps EIS "is not likely to be the end for you," the builders were told by Susan Asmus, who develops and manages the regulatory policies of the

Washington, D.C.-based National Association of Home Builders. "There's a trend for lawsuits and initiatives on the state and regional levels to restrict growth nationwide," she said. She pointed to a proposal to preserve 20 percent of the remaining land in the Chesapeake Bay watershed bordered by Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and Washington, D.C. Local developers should look for sections of the EIS that lend themselves to accommodation, she said. Another speaker, Orlando attorney Ted Brown, focused on the limits to development posed by the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, which aims to prevent species from going extinct. That's been interpreted to mean that subspecies or

See TRENCHES / 2D

South Lee mall race has third contender

By LAURA RUANE
The News-Press

The owner of Fort Myers' Edison Mall officially has entered the race to build a new mall in Estero.

Indianapolis-based Simon Property Group Inc. filed a proposal this week with the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council to build a regional mall at the corner of U.S. 41 and Coconut Road.

Simon Suncoast actually would be a mixed-use development, including 1.8 million square feet for retailing, 300,000 square feet of office space, and up to 600 hotel rooms, 500 apartments, 500 condominiums and 200 assisted-living units.

The McArdle family owns the 483-acre site, which is bounded by The Brooks residential development, U.S. 41, Williams Road and Bonita Springs Industrial Park.

It will take more than a year for the mall proposal to clear all the governmental hurdles, said Dan Trescott, chief reviewer of major projects for the planning council.

Two other contenders are further along the paperwork trail:

■ The Rouse Co. of Columbia, Md., which recently won Lee County clearance to build a regional mall at the southwest corner of Alico Road and Three Oaks Parkway.

■ The Richard E. Jacobs Group of Cleveland, which is awaiting word from a county hearing examiner on its proposal to build Gulf Coast Towne Centre mall near the southeast corner of Interstate 75 and Alico Road.

"I think one of these sites will make it," Trescott said.

"We have the best location, dead-center on the retail spine of Southwest Florida," said Thomas Schneider, senior vice president of Simon Property Group.

— Laura Ruane can be reached at 335-0392.

School System. Sterling award competition teams are from Shell Point Pavilion; the Ritz-Carlton, Naples; East Point/Gulf Coast Hospital; Gulf Coast Center; Southwest Florida Regional Medical Center; Shaw Aero; Lee Memorial Hospital; and the Florida Department of Children and Families.

Tickets, \$75 for an individual, may be purchased at the door from 8 to 9 a.m. For more information, call 278-4001.

Hendry County tops in citrus trees per acre

Hendry County continues to lead the state in commercial citrus trees, but the region dipped slightly in both trees and planted citrus acreage, according to a recently released federal survey.

Florida's biennial Commercial Citrus Inventory showed 832,275 acres planted in citrus as of January. That's a net decrease of 12,985 acres statewide over the past two years.

In citrus acreage, Polk County led with 101,484 — followed by Hendry County with 99,437 and St. Lucie County with 98,899. These three counties comprise more than one-third of the citrus acreage in the state.

In trees, Hendry was tops, averaging 154 per acre, 20 percent above the state average.

The Gulf Citrus area of Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry and Lee counties saw planted acreage decline by 1,353 acres since the 1998 census, to 178,595 acres.

Much of the loss resulted from removal of grapefruit trees due to the crop's volatile prices and from some properties' exposure to citrus canker, said Ron Hamel, an executive with the Gulf Citrus Growers Association.

TECO plans to sell debt securities

TECO Energy Inc. filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission to sell as much as \$350 million of debt securities.

The Tampa electric and gas utility holding company will use the proceeds for general corporate purposes, according to a shelf registration filed

Somebody these employees and every time it comes up, even if it's not finished before the election, she said.

"There's things left for now. It's all things."

Mayor Br is up for recomment. To Riccobono's along with V might mean. Although expected to week, he added. Riccobono's public works the largest in be managed deputy public tor.

"But Al is Eminette left good shape th the departme ue with no p Randy S) spokesman.

Riccobono's Aug. 28 resign Abdo said he position effect.

Public Wo tionally han such as r Riccobono ha role in recent sewer lines a garbage and re ups and other.

But in a reorganization Grady added p cation and la Waite's and ment's duties.

See R11

CORRECTIO

■ Gene Craver station manager for WGPU-FM 90.1. His last nar was misspelled a story in Friday local section.

did not have a probable cause.

Hornsby, the grand daughter of prominent Fort My businessman George Sanders, had nothing to do with the murders.

The Lee County Sheriff's Office issued a prepared statement saying McDougall will appeal the decision to the Second District Court of Appeal and "is confident the original suspension will be upheld."

"The sheriff asserts that, as a matter of law, Mr. Van House was not denied due process during the appeal hearing on his suspension," the statement said. "The record supports this claim."

Van House did not return a call placed to him at work.

McDougall took the action against Van House, Sgt. Augustin Malagon and Agent Matthew LeClair after reviewing the results of his department's two-week internal investigation into Hornsby's complaint.

Van House, a 14-year member of the department assigned to a joint narcotics task force with the federal Drug Enforcement

suit against McDougall. The civil service board. McIver's ruling pertains only to him.

The investigation found that Malagon and LeClair detained and handcuffed Hornsby despite the fact Van House told them it didn't appear she was connected to the search for the three murder suspects. Van House was negligent for not stopping the other two deputies when they detained and handcuffed her, the findings state.

"The errors made in this case are the product of officers making decisions based on speculation rather than fact," an investigator wrote. "Sergeant Malagon and agent LeClair demonstrated a careless disregard for Mrs. Hornsby's rights."

The sheriff's office press release goes on to say that, "It wasn't until after (Van House) lost did he begin to complain about the hearing process."

—Contact Sharon Turco at sturco@news-press.com or at 335-0439.

Estero growth standards outlined by citizen group

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

ESTERO — A group called the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization has outlined what they think Estero should look like in the future.

They want standards for signs, architecture and landscape. They also want commercial corridors separated from parks and residential areas.

Such standards, said the group's chairman, Neal Noethlich, will ensure that Estero maintains its residential feel.

The idea to create a community plan came after some Estero residents were angered at developments approved by county commissioners.

Residents have been upset with recent development approvals such as a proposed car dealership and the county's use of "bubble plans" that allow a wide variety of commercial uses. They claim they have little say about the appearance of their community and decided the best way to fight unlimited development is by drafting their own community plan.

The plan would enable residents to decide what their community looks like.

But not all residents or develop-

ers in the community of 5,532 agree with the group's wish list.

Frank Weed, president of the West Bay Club, said while he thinks the group is responsible and agreed with some of what it wants, he is concerned about several items on the wish list.

Weed said he took particular interest in items that dealt with the development approval process and architectural standards.

"What we're hoping for is that these ideas will permeate the (community) plan and the Land Development Code," Noethlich said of his group's ideas. "We're proud of this document and we don't consider it to be knee-jerk — some people might."

Weed said the group's recommendation to have the applicant provide specific intended land use for a project — getting rid of bubble plans — and the intended time frame for completing development would also be difficult. He said what may work in a certain location today may not be viable for a developer in a few months.

"You need flexibility to deal with the marketplace," Weed said.

— Contact Mark S. Krzos at mkrzos@news-press.com or 992-1345.

SEEKING... great job," she...
EQUIPMENT R... WILL BE...
INCLUDES FPL REBATE FROM \$...
— Contact Jen Reed at jreed@com or 992-134

F... on effo
Yog...
Pris Const...
The Nev...
The News-Press guarant... equal to or greater than... your newspaper every da...
— Contact Jen Reed at jreed@com or 992-134



Charles E. "Gene" Co MD, FACS
Board Certified Ophthalmolog
26 YEARS EXPERIENC

LABOR
7' BAYPORT 1000
\$799
FREE DELIVERY!
RECREATION
FT. MYER
2355 COLONIAL BLVD. AT THE COR...
(941) 939-5

Re-
PA
S

Ed. Pol. Adv. By P/

8/31/00 News Press

[<< Back to News](#)

Editorial: Aggressive protection needed now

Manage growth more intelligently in booming Estero

Poorly managed growth has people upset in Estero and the environment hurting in Estero Bay. Maybe Lee County will wake up to a recent convergence of complaints and fears and start trying to better serve the booming community and its environment.

An Estero Bay advisory group may ask for a moratorium on new state permits that add to the alarming increase in pollution in the system, where rapid growth is degrading one of the state's great coastal ecosystems.

This would hardly mean an end to growth in south Lee County. Significant additional development has already been approved. But the moratorium idea is well worth a look, especially if it gives planners time to revise Estero's portion of the county plan.

What's happening in the bay is the downstream effect of the same growth that drew a standing-room crowd to the South County Regional Library recently to talk about developing a plan to shape the growth of the community over the next 20 years.

This was what comprehensive planning was supposed to have been accomplishing for decades. But people in Estero know it has not worked. Permissive development standards threaten to swamp their cherished way of life. They're up in arms.

The county seems to be trying to answer Estero's demands for better planning. If it fails, and this community follows Fort Myers Beach and Bonita Springs into municipal incorporation to control its future, the county will drop another notch toward irrelevancy.

On the environmental front, the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management wants to give the Estero Bay system some breathing space while water managers and local planners get a grip on the subtle problem of "non-point source" pollution. That contamination comes not from specific points like sewer plants, which are usually relatively easy to deal with, but from widespread rain runoff from streets, parking lots, farms, fertilized lawns and other sources.

That pollution is very hard to control, but until we at least know how much there is and what it is doing to Estero Bay and its tributaries, it makes sense not to add to it.

The bay management board represents a variety of agencies whose officials may not be sympathetic to a moratorium on permits, even a short one. The board will wait to hear from them before voting on whether to call officially for a moratorium.

But seven years of official study show the bay is suffering from the classic symptoms, declining oxygen and increasing phosphorus.

John Cassani, a scientist who drafted a letter to the South Florida Water Management District and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection calling for the moratorium, says, "I think we need to make a stand, and I think now is the time to do it."

We need better, more aggressive management of future growth, to protect what we have in the environment and to preserve the quality of life we all



CareerPath.com
Find local jobs or national jobs. Place your resume on the Internet.

Search news-press.com

Local

[News](#)
[Sports](#)
[Business](#)
[Opinion](#)
[Weather](#)
[Entertainment](#)

Marketplace

[Classifieds](#)
[Auto](#)
[Apartments](#)
[Employment](#)
[New Homes](#)
[Resale Homes](#)
[Coupons](#)

About us

[Contact Us](#)
[Subscribe](#)
[Archives](#)
[Obituaries](#)
[Jobs-Press jobs](#)
[Delivery positions](#)
[Photo Re-prints](#)

Special

Sections

[Hurricane 2000](#)
[At Home](#)
[Hot Link](#)
[Health and Medicine](#)
[Summer Golf Guide](#)

treasure.

That mission requires careful development, the lowest density over what is consistent with property rights and much more care for the cumulative impact of growth on the natural resources that lie at the base of it all.


That's why the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has gotten involved in growth issues in Lee County.

People who don't like that intrusion from Washington have a chance in the case of Estero to show that we can manage our own growth intelligently.

Newcomers Guide



Your guide to Southwest Florida



Technology news
and information

Copyright 2000, The News-Press. Use of this site signifies your agreement to our [Terms of Service](#). (Updated Feb. 28, 1999)

Estero to map its vision

Lee commissioners
to vote on giving
matching funds

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

FORT MYERS — Lee County commissioners are set to approve matching funds of up to \$25,000 for Estero and other communities that want to develop their own community plans.

Commissioner Ray Judah said Monday during a management and planning meeting he would bring the topic up for a vote during today's meeting.

Estero residents, upset with the continuous construction and having little say about the appearance of their community, decided the best way to fight unlimited development is by drafting their own community plan.

Once completed, Estero's plan will be included in Lee County's Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Judah said while the county does not have the resources to develop community plans, areas such as Estero are encouraged to shape their own vision.

"This is really something the Estero area needs," said Meg Venceller, chairwoman of the Estero Chamber of Commerce.

The county will provide \$6,250 for the first phase of the community plan. The Estero Chamber of Commerce will then send out letters to members asking for donations to complete the plan in phase two, Venceller said.

"If we raise \$5,000, then we'll be able to go back to the county and ask them for matching funds," Venceller said.

"This gives them the seed money they need to develop their own vision for their community," said Mitch Hutchcraft, the consultant hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to craft the community's vision for inclusion in the Lee Plan.

Paul O'Connor, Lee County's director of planning, said several areas within unincorporated Lee County have been seeking to develop community plans.

"Do we want to support them? Do we want to sup-

port them monetarily? And if so, how much?" O'Connor said.

Communities seeking county funding to develop plans similar to Estero's will have to meet a set of criteria, O'Connor said.

"That can be put together in a week — week and a half," O'Connor said. "I'm committed to bring the Estero issue back up in a month or so."

Venceller wrote to Lee County Commission Chairman John Albion on July 26 asking the county to pay for the first phase of the Estero plan. She had hoped commissioners would approve the \$6,250 cost to have Hutchcraft complete the plan by Sept. 29 — the deadline for submitting amendments to the Lee County Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

O'Connor said he was confident Estero can have the first phase of the plan ready by the deadline.

Venceller said phase two of the Estero plan, where certain development criteria are targeted and included in the plan, is expected to cost between \$10,000 and \$15,000.

Venceller said Estero residents will have a chance to help create a vision for their community's development at 6:30 p.m. on Aug. 15 in the South County Regional Library.

"They'll get to say what they wish to be included in the Lee Plan such as setbacks, buffers, commercial and retail areas, community areas — so it looks like a planned community," Venceller said.

Residents will be joined by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, the Estero Civic Association, area planners, developers and environmentalists to establish a community vision.

The intent of the workshop is to solicit input, identify key community issues and develop a consensus on implementing the community's vision.

Another public meeting will be in September, before the deadline.

In other discussions Monday, commissioners told staff to come up with a report on how to limit truck use on Corkscrew Road.

— Contact Mark S. Krzos at mkrzos@news-press.com or 992-1345.

Jun. 8/8/2000
News-Press

Site sections...

Front page | Classified | GoShopBonita

naplesnews.com

Bonita | Bonita Daily News

✉ 📄 📞 🔍 Bonita front | Bonita archive | help

Estero residents meet tonight on development proposal

Tuesday, August 15, 2000

By CHARLIE WHITEHEAD, Staff Writer

The future begins tonight for the community of Estero.

With an eye toward seizing control of the community's future, residents will gather at South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway to begin fashioning a communitywide development plan. The plan will be an attempt to marry the desires of residents with those in the business community, allowing for the future growth of the community while protecting the residents' vision.

That is vital if the plan is to go further than the planning stage, according to Lee County Planning Director Paul O'Connor. If the community expects Lee County commissioners to approve sweeping changes in the growth management plan, the community plan will have to be one supported by more than just one group of residents or businesses.

"If the planning effort is to be successful, it has to be very broad-based," O'Connor said. "It will have to be somewhat embraced by the entire community."

O'Connor said he has encouraged the various groups that have jointly launched the effort to make a concerted effort to include every portion of the community, from the most ambitious developer to the most strident preservationist. Otherwise, he said, commissioners aren't likely to make changes that dramatically affect the area's future.

GO
SHOP BONITA
 Shop for a home, a car, a job, a place to eat, a gift and more!



Custom builders of "Southern" style homes

REGISTERED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

St. Croix
 at Pelican Marsh
 Tour our island paradise rental apartment community

Play like a Pro with
 *Richard Wolfe*

Watch boats go by & the dolphins play while you dine at
SNOOK INN


Karen Sweatlock
 CRS GRI
 Selling Naples' exquisite real estate


Eileen Galvin, executive director of the Estero Chamber of Commerce, said tonight's meeting is likely to help residents of the community better understand the way the plan will be developed.

"Most of the people are not knowledgeable about how the county works, but it's up to the residents of Estero to put their input into it," Galvin said.

The community has hired local professional planner Mitch Hutchcraft to draft proposed growth plan changes specific to Estero. The county has also stepped up with funding. Commissioners agreed last week to provide as much as \$25,000 in matching funds for so-called sector plans.

O'Connor, however, prefers "community plans."

"I want to call them community plans," he said. "People want a better sense of community. People don't live in a sector. They live in a community."

In Estero, the planning effort will take place in two phases. To amend the growth plan this year, changes must be proposed by the end of September. O'Connor said the community should address the issues it considers most pressing, with an eye toward presenting another round of changes next year.

"Ideally, when you do a community plan, it would take eight to 14 months. The community felt that waiting a year was not going to work," he said.

Galvin said she was pleased Estero residents would help decide how the community will evolve in the future. "The best way is to let all the people have a voice in it," she said.

Tonight's meeting is set for 6:30 p.m.

 [E-mail this story to a friend.](#)

 [Format this story for printing.](#)

 [Fax this story for free.](#)

 [Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)



Bonita & Ester

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2000

Session to tackle controlling Estero growth

Input being sought at Aug. 15 meeting

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

ESTERO — Estero community leaders are beginning to form a plan to control development.

At 6:30 p.m. on Aug. 15 in the South County Regional Library, Estero residents will have a chance to help create a vision for their community's development.

Residents will be joined by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, the Estero Civic Association, area planners, developers and environmentalists to establish a community vision.

The intent of the workshop is to solicit input, identify key community issues and develop a consensus on implementing the community's vision.

A consultant already has been hired by the Chamber, and officials hope the county will pay for the first phase

of the plan. "We're in an area with a lot of undeveloped land, so we have a wonderful opportunity to set standards," said Venceller, chairwoman of the chamber and the association.

Frank Weed, president of the West Bay Club, agreed. "The key area we're interested in is that the remainder of this area is done in a high-quality manner," he said. "We don't want (Estero) to be honky-tonk."

Weed said his vision for

Estero is something between Tampa's Hyde Park and Naples' Fifth Avenue.

"No one wants to see gas station after gas station on the roadway," he said. "We don't want to see excessive development."

Venceller said in developing a community plan, residents can dictate future architectural and landscaping requirements for all new developments.

See SECTOR / 3

FROM PAGE 1

"We have a vision of Estero," Venceller said. "We want people to know they're in Estero, that it is an aesthetically pleasing place, that we do have standards."

There is a problem, though.

Venceller said the master plan must be completed before Sept. 29 — the deadline for submitting amendments to the Lee County Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

To meet that deadline, Venceller said after the Aug. 15 meeting, planning firm Vanasse & Daylor will compile resident comments, begin working with county officials and prepare the language for the amendment to the Lee Plan.

Another public meeting will be in September, before the deadline.

"In September, we'll say, 'This is what we're going to present,'" Venceller said.

David Graham, vice president of planning and development for Bonita Bay Properties, said he views the plan as benefitting everyone in the Estero area.

"To me, it's the reason most areas incorporate — to control their own process," he said.

Paul O'Connor, the county's director of planning, said community plans have to incorporate all of the residents' concerns.

"If you have a one-sided plan, there's no way it'll get county approval," O'Connor said.

Neal Noethlich, chairman of the Estero Concerned Citizens Organization, agreed.

"It has to be a broad-based for-

um because it failed to address the concerns of people with development potential "it died on the vine."

Funding for the creation of the Estero plan could come from the county. Venceller wrote to Lee County Commission Chairman John Albion on July 26 asking the county to pay for the first phase of the Estero plan.

Albion said he supports county involvement in the plan and hopes commissioners approve the \$6,250 cost to have Vanasse & Daylor complete the plan by the deadline date.

"In the past, the county has provided some seed money for developing sector plans," said Mary Gibbs, the county's community development director.

Gibbs said the county has provided funds for the development of sector plans for Pine Island and Fort Myers Beach.

O'Connor said the county will discuss its policy toward planning studies Monday at its next management meeting.

"We'll look at funding and personnel," O'Connor said. "Things like how much is being spent? Is it being spent properly? I need direction to the board."

Venceller said phase two of the Estero plan, where certain development criteria are targeted and included in the plan, is expected to cost between \$10,000 and \$15,000. "The chamber would pay a portion of that as well as the county," she said.

Site sections... Front page | Classified | GoShopNaples

http://www.naplesnews.com

Bonita | Bonita Daily News

✉ 📧 📞 🌐 Bonita front | Bonita archive | help

Vacant Estero property approved for development as Trailside Broadway retail center

Thursday, August 17, 2000

By CHAD GILLIS, Staff Writer

ESTERO — A long-vacant grassy parcel in the heart of Estero received approval from a county hearing examiner for 18,000 square feet of retail space Wednesday.

The project, known as Trailside Broadway, encompasses a 1.63-acre piece with four vacant lots, three single-family homes and a model home. The property, which sits on the northwest corner of the Broadway/U.S. 41 intersection, is currently zoned for single-family developments.

Dorris Bella, one of a handful of property owners involved in the case, said the development probably will consist mostly of retail stores such as a bakery, specialty clothing or a wellness center.


"We do not want a strip mall," Bella said. "We want something more Key West-style with a village-type shopping area."

Bella said she and her husband, developer Paul Bella, want to cater to residents in the Broadway area.

The first phase will consist of a spa and wellness center located in an existing model home on the northern edge of the property. Bella said the entire project, which is scheduled to be built in three phases, will house four to six retailers.

Lee County Hearing Examiner Diana Parker included a condition in her recommendation of approval to include an 8-foot-high wall along the western edge of the property to act as a buffer between the future development and existing nearby residences.

Parker added conditions to a requested restaurant, recommending the county restrict outdoor restaurant uses to 10 a.m. until 8 p.m. daily. She



For all your Real Estate needs, contact your beach & waterfront specialists...



also deleted several requested uses from the recommendation, including hardware store, pet shops, indoor storage and animal clinics.

Rezoning cases generally go before Lee County commissioners for a final vote between four and six weeks after the examiner releases a recommendation.

 [E-mail this story to a friend.](#)

 [Format this story for printing.](#)

 [Fax this story for free.](#)

 [Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)

Navigation:

[Go to today's Bonita section front](#)
[Go to our 7-day Bonita archive](#)


[Go to another section...](#) 

Also in this week's Bonita section:

- [Bonita City Council: Citizen proposes new city hall built around Community Hall](#)
- [Bonita City Council: Planning, zoning boards set dates to get down to business](#)
- [Bonita City Council: With 66 applicants, permanent city manager expected by ...](#)
- [Bonita firefighter/EMTs get training in intravenous therapy](#)
- [Brent Batten: If the Democrats put out a soundtrack, it would go to #1](#)
- [D'Alessandro defends decision to locate white collar crime unit in Lee County](#)
- [Kay Smith: Army Corps to publish public notices on its Web site](#)
- [Lee schools: ACT scores drop as number of test-takers rise](#)
- [Lee schools: Despite frantic effort, no more Lee schools reach fire code ...](#)
- [Lee schools: New teacher pay scale raises first-year salaries by 6.3 percent](#)
- [Locals fear Pine Ridge road-widening project will be major disruption](#)
- [NCH proposes plan to add 30 rehab beds to downtown Naples hospital](#)
- [Photo: FGCU students begin move onto campus](#)
- [Police Beat: Bonita Springs, south Lee County](#)
- [Propane leak at asphalt plant shuts down Alico Road for three hours](#)
- [Regional Planning Council to discuss Tampa's Olympic bid](#)
- [State senator talks to those affected by area's dwindling level of social ...](#)
- [Vacant Estero property approved for development as Trailside Broadway retail ...](#)

Feedback:

- [E-mail the naplesnews.com staff](#)
- [Write a letter to the editor](#)
- [View our directory of Daily News staff](#)
- [See our Help section for more assistance](#)



Postcards:
Send an electronic postcard to somebody you know.

Coupons: 
Save at local area businesses.

Advertise...
...on the Internet! Find out our rates and details.

Subscribe:
Get the print edition of

Estero's political pendulum swings back to residents on issue of growth

Monday, June 26, 2000

By **CHAD GILLIS**, Staff Writer

For the last couple of years a political war of sorts has been brewing in Estero over the pace and type of development in this fast-growing community.

On one side, there are big-name developers, influential businesses and a seemingly endless supply of well-connected consultants and high-powered attorneys. On the other side is a group of local residents, most of them retired, many of them in town only a few months a year, virtually none with lobbying or political backgrounds.

If the battle seems unfair, it's not. In this clash of David vs. Goliath, David is starting to sling some really big rocks.

Estero residents have banded together in the face of increasing development pressures, forming a civic mob of sorts. They've flooded public meetings, picketed proposed developments, signed petitions, hired their own consultants.

Now they've advanced their strategy to include changing the county land development code to protect their community.

Just a few of the battles won recently in Estero include persuading Galloway Ford to drop its plans for a car lot in front of Fountain Lakes and county commissioners to change the criteria for which neighborhood developments are large enough for increased scrutiny, and supporting an increased setback for commercial developments along Corkscrew Road.

Outspoken civic leader **Arnold Rosenthal** said Estero residents have united in the past couple of years, and especially in the last six months, because they're worried about what their community will look like a few years from now.

"It's only lately where we've seen what's happening and that we've started asking questions," Rosenthal said. "There's a general awakening of residents, especially in Estero, that our quality of life is at risk."

Estero's next victory could be its biggest yet.

Less than two weeks ago, Development Services Director **Mary Gibbs** told Estero residents she planned to propose the county drop bubble plans — blueprints often used at rezoning cases that have a long list of approved uses, giving little detail to what is going to be built and where. Bubble plans are a sore point in Estero, where residents complain they give developers leeway to build almost anything.

Local developers say they'll watch any land code changes closely, saying they might have to start fighting fire with fire.

Greg Stuart, president of Stuart and Associates in Fort Myers, said he fears that if bubble plans are dropped by the county the next step could be limiting the list of approved uses within developments to only a handful — a measure most Estero residents would also favor.

"If (the county) does that I guarantee there will be a huge political uproar," Stuart said. "You would be forced to go into a planned development with a limited time frame with one or two or three uses. That strikes to the heart of fairness and equal protection."

Stuart knows the situation in Estero well. He represented the overall development on which the Galloway lot was proposed. Stuart said Estero residents show up in flocks to certain hearings while having virtually no presence in other, similar cases.

"I think what they're trying to do is a little bit of an over-reaction," Stuart said. "This is a ying-yang situation. If these people are playing politics, the real estate and development community will do the same."

Stuart suggested a balance between what Estero residents want and what is already in place.

Residents like Rosenthal and Larry Newell, a key figure in the protest of the Galloway lot, want more control over commercial developments and more specificity in zoning cases.

Newell said the bubble plans must be eliminated and he would like to see county commissioners down-zone land — changing the zoning of property to allow less intensive development — in certain areas of Estero to prevent situations like a car lot being approved in front of a residential community.

Commissioners have said in the past that down-zoning costs money because the county must by law reimburse landowners for any lost value of their property.

That response is not good enough for Newell.

"Don't hide behind the fear of having to cough up some money," Newell said, saying any funds spent to offset down-zoning would be money well spent.

Newell said Estero has few options: protesting individual developments the community doesn't like or lobbying for down-zoning or a sector plan, which would call for coming up with a zoning plan specific to the Estero area.

None of those options promises much immediate relief.

Planning Director Paul O'Connor said if Gibbs recommends the county ax bubble plans, the decision would not come before county commissioners for another six to eight months.

As for the sector plan approach, O'Connor said residents could piecemeal a plan, approaching a few major changes over the next couple of months and working on a more long-range plan to submit by the end of September 2001. Any changes suggested by residents this summer would be looked at around the same time the county would consider Gibbs' bubble plan proposal.

O'Connor wasn't optimistic about how much residents could do by this year's deadline, which falls in about 10 weeks.

"I don't see that they could get much put together in two and a half months as far as Lee plan amendments go," O'Connor said, adding that funds could become an obstacle as well.

"If this is a grass-roots approach ... there will be the issue of how much money can they raise to hire consultants."

For Rosenthal, a building moratorium in Estero is the only answer that would give residents and county government the time to pen a usable, fair sector plan that would protect the quality of life in south Lee County at the same time it promoted healthy growth. Without the growth suspension, Rosenthal said, developers would simply rush to beat an imposing sector plan.

Rosenthal described the decrease in all'ed neighborhood commercial projects as a positive start to what he hopes will be a continued pattern of development code reforms.

"It's a Band-Aid put over a gaping wound," Rosenthal said. "We want to keep that and then carry that momentum rward."

Still, he called for a further alliance among those in the unincorporated area of Lee County to evoke notable changes.

"If Estero can make this much of a difference by itself think of what ... we all could do if we pushed this quality-of-life issue," he said. "We could elect a majority of the commission that would be sympathetic to our views. And there must be people in areas other than Estero who are sick of these 4-1 votes."

Rosenthal was referring to Commissioner Ray Judah's historical track record of being the lone dissenter in various commercial rezonings. Board slots occupied by Judah and Commissioners John Manning and John Albion will be voted on this year during a November general election. Manning does not plan to run for re-election.

Rosenthal, who is on a private crusade this summer to get as many candidates as possible on the County Commission ballot for the fall election, said he would like to see more specificity put back in the land development code to help restrain commercial growth.

Newell echoes Rosenthal's concerns, saying it's county commissioners' job to repair what he said are overly developer-friendly land use codes.

"Who got us into this situation?" Newell said. "Who committed the original sin? It goes right back to the County Commission."

ommissioners will vote for a second time Tuesday night on proposed changes to the land development code that include an increased setback for commercial development along Corkscrew Road. If approved on the upcoming vote, the changes will become an official part of Lee's land development code.

 E-mail this story to a friend.

 Format this story for printing.

 Fax this story for free.

 Search our archive for related stories:

advanced search

Navigation:

Go to today's Bonita section front
Go to our 7-day Bonita archive

Go to another section... ▼

Also in this week's Bonita section:

[45 new teachers added to the rolls at south Lee schools](#)
[Bonita has emergency plan ready in case of a hurricane](#)
[Cycle safety: SW Florida's only motorcycle safety class offered in Fort Myers](#)
[lection 2000: Florida Democrats didn't want to lose Graham to the national ...](#)
[orida nears adoption of standards for children's care at hospitals](#)
[ospitals work to avoid adverse drug effects in patients](#)
[Kay Smith: New bank to open in February](#)
[Michael Peltier: Death penalty witness ... a day of personal reckoning](#)
[Regional cable companies try to ferret out signal pirates](#)
[Report gives first hard data on state of America's seniors](#)

Lee Commission: Judah, Estero residents try to find common ground over zoning rules

Thursday, June 15, 2000

By CHAD GILLIS, Staff Writer

ESTERO — About 150 Estero residents met with a handful of Lee County officials Wednesday night at Riverwoods Plantation to discuss zoning regulations and how the community may be able to protect itself from large-scale commercial developments that some residents say don't fit.

Initially the meeting was centered around an information exchange between Lee Commissioner Ray Judah and residents. But it blossomed, as Judah brought representatives of the county attorney's office, community development and planning department along.

Fountain Lakes resident Larry Newell, who recently fought a proposed 10-acre Galloway car lot along with dozens of other residents from his community, opened the meeting by saying that the amount of unseemly commercial development in Estero has gone too far.



Ray Judah

Community Development Director Mary Gibbs suggested residents consider a sector plan that would allow residents and developers to tailor growth requirements for the community. The plan would, in essence, be a modification of the county's growth plan, a fine-tuning, she said.

"It's just a little mini-plan for the area," Gibbs said. "It keeps you focused on the big picture. You have to decide what you want your community to look like in 10 years."

Gibbs said a sector plan would give Estero an identity, as well as ensuring residents would not have to rally the troops and trek to Fort Myers every time a development is proposed.

County Planning Director Paul O'Connor said the planning staff will look at land development code changes and amendments for next year. He added that residents could approach the larger task of a sector plan by focusing on a few important goals this year while waiting to work out minute details in the future.

O'Connor said residents would be more likely to persuade commissioners to adopt a sector plan if the entire community was involved in the planning process, including commercial developers. He suggested residents work with developers and attorneys and not against them.

Recently, many Estero residents have been unsettled about various proposed commercial developments in the area. Others say they should have more input on zoning decisions and know about the proposed developments well in advance of public hearings.

Assistant County Attorney Tim Jones said the county should extend its notice of public hearing requirements to at least two weeks. Current regulations call for notification at least one week before hearing examiner meetings.

"I have personally felt for a long time that there's not sufficient notice," Jones said.

Jones said if residents had two weeks notice they would have enough time to schedule a meeting with developers and try to work out a compromise or get more information about what is being planned near their homes. He said if a deal could not be struck, residents would still have enough time to plan for public hearings and hire consultants if they wished.

Jones suggested residents lobby county commissioners to get the notice period extended.

Estero resident Carl Hoke criticized the county for allowing what is referred to as bubble plans — a vague list of possible uses that gives little specificity or parameters regarding what will actually be built within a development.

"You simply cannot give a two-page laundry list of uses and not expect trouble," Hoke said. "The way it is now, you're just handing out laundry lists and buying problems."

Gibbs said she plans to propose the county stop allowing bubble plans within the next year.

After the meeting, Hoke said he wasn't sure which route Estero should take to ensure acceptable future growth. He said he'd want to see the possibilities of a sector plan and the benefits of either incorporating or annexing into Bonita Springs before making a decision.

Barbara Akins, a spokesperson for the group ECCO (Estero Citizens Community Organization), said the best option for Estero is to follow O'Connor's advice and come up with a list of critical areas that need the most attention before the Sept. 30 planning staff deadline.

"I think the urgency is identifying and locating the appropriate documents that we think need to be changed," Akins said.

 [E-mail this story to a friend.](#)

 [Format this story for printing.](#)

 [Fax this story for free.](#)

 [Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)

Navigation:

[Go to today's Bonita section front](#)

[Go to our 7-day Bonita archive](#)

[Go to another section...](#)

Also in this week's Bonita section:

[45 new teachers added to the rolls at south Lee schools](#)

[Bonita has emergency plan ready in case of a hurricane](#)

[Cycle safety: SW Florida's only motorcycle safety class offered in Fort Myers](#)

[Election 2000: Florida Democrats didn't want to lose Graham to the national ...](#)

[Florida nears adoption of standards for children's care at hospitals](#)

[Hospitals work to avoid adverse drug effects in patients](#)

[Kay Smith: New bank to open in February](#)

[Michael Peltier: Death penalty witness ... a day of personal reckoning](#)

[Regional cable companies try to ferret out signal pirates](#)

[Report gives first hard data on state of America's seniors](#)

Feedback:

[E-mail the naplesnews.com staff](#)

[Write a letter to the editor](#)

[View our directory of Daily News staff](#)

[See our Help section for more assistance](#)

Population boom inspires incorporation talk in Estero

Tuesday, November 25, 1997

Naples Daily News

Section: 03-Bonita Local

Edition: Final

Published: 10/14/97

Page: D01

Byline: By KARA VICK, Staff Writer

A burgeoning population in Estero is forcing residents to consider incorporating the area into a city.

Members of the Estero Civic Association decided to form a committee to research this possibility after Mary Gibbs, director of Community Development for Lee County spoke to the group Monday about current and future development in Estero.

Gibbs said over the past several years, while the county's population growth has been at 14 percent, Estero has grown by 21 percent. With the nearby presence of Florida Gulf Coast University and 18,000 houses approved to be built in the area, Estero's population will grow from its present 4,700 to a whopping 40,000 over the next 10 years - without county seasonal residents.

"The changes that will happen in Estero are really amazing," Gibbs said.

One of the biggest developments recently approved by the Lee County Commissioners is The Brooks, a 2,500 acre development that plans for 5,200 homes and 250,000 square feet of businesses. A 700,000 square foot outlet mall is planned for the interchange at Interstate 75 and Corkscrew Road. A proposal for a 7,900 seat hockey stadium will be voted upon by the commission this week.

"It's scary," said Commissioner Ray Judah of the growth. Judah's district includes Estero and Bonita Springs.

Judah, who was also invited as a guest speaker at the association's first meeting after the summer break, said he would support the residents' attempts at incorporation.

"I'll help you with every ounce of energy I have," Judah said.

He said the county commission isn't making the best land use decisions for the area. "Politicians say they want to keep taxes down but then they approve wide scale developments," Judah said.

Judah said incorporation saved Fort Myers Beach. "It'll protect you from the county," he said to 100 people who attended the meeting.

For a community that just got its first grocery store, Estero's growing pains are evident. People are frustrated with so much development but forming a city might not solve all the problems, said Estero Civic Association Chairman Meg Venceller.

It would be expensive to create a town government complete with its own police force, Venceller said. But on the

other hand, having a city would finally give the area defining boundaries. The boundary confusion is a result of having separate fire districts and post office districts.

Venceller said at one point Estero was incorporated but she doesn't know why the city was dissolved.

As the Estero Civic Association studies the possibility of incorporation, it will continue to work as a watchdog to the county commission by reviewing proposed developments for the area, Venceller said.

"Growth is coming. We live in America. We can't stop it. We must prepare for it," Venceller said.

Copyright 1997, Naples Daily News. All rights reserved.

[\[Main Page\]](#) [\[Local\]](#) [\[Bonita\]](#) [\[Marco\]](#) [\[Florida\]](#) [\[Nation/World\]](#) [\[Sports\]](#) [\[Business\]](#) [\[Editorial\]](#) [\[Neapolitan\]](#) [\[Entertainment\]](#) [\[Health & Science\]](#) [\[Computers\]](#) [\[Real Estate\]](#) [\[Classifieds\]](#) [\[Feedback\]](#)

Community Input



Department of Environmental Protection

Page 1

Jeb Bush
Governor

Koreshan State Historic Site
PO Box 7
Estero, FL 33928
(941)992-0311

David B. Struhs
Secretary

September 25, 2000

Mr. Mitchel A. Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

Dear Mr. Hutchcraft,

I have taken the time to review the Preliminary Draft of The Estero Community Plan and have the following comments:

The state park should be referred to as Koreshan State Historic Site throughout the document.

The Koreshan Unity Settlement is a National Historic District. The portion of the Koreshan Unity Settlement Historic District found in Koreshan State Historic Site is located within a 40 acre parcel adjacent to US Highway 41. The District extends to the east, across US Highway 41 on the grounds currently managed by the Koreshan Unity Foundation. The total acreage of the state park is 192.6 acres. Mound Key State Archaeological Site a 166.6 acre parcel found on the island of Mound Key is located at the mouth of the Estero River and is also managed by staff at Koreshan S.H.S. Accessible by boat, Mound Key is a highly significant resource that should be considered in this plan as well.

Twelve historic structures, seven landscape features, extensive artifact and archival collections are maintained by the park. The Koreshan Unity Settlement is not maintained by the state as a "religious shrine". The national register nomination form prepared by the Department of State, Division of Historic Resources in 1975 described the significance of the site as follows:

"The physical remains of the Koreshan community are preserved because they represent a unique philosophical and religious movement, because they illustrate a cooperative settlement of the past era and because they are remnants of a pioneer community which, in many ways, typified life on the south Florida frontier around the turn of the twentieth century. The extant gardens are of value to tropical horticulturalists."

Accurate representation of the site is crucial to the support and success of community planning efforts.

Mitchel Hutchcraft
September 25, 2000
Page 2

Management guidelines for the park are described in Unit Management Plans for both parks. Unit plan development has directly involved input from community representation in a DEP Advisory Groups. The Advisory Group for the Koreshan State Historic Site Unit Management Plan met in March, 2000 to provide input in the development of the current plan.

Unit Plans provide a management program overview, a description of the resources as well as conceptual land use plans that guide activities associated with natural and cultural resource management and any facility development. Any needs, uses or facility development described in the community plan which directly involve the use of state lands associated with these parks should reflect the management direction described in the plan. If you would like to review a copy of the unit plan, please let me know.

Policy 19.1.5 and Policy 19.6.2 creation of a public plaza/interpretive area for vehicular access would be difficult with the congestion, noise and traffic levels that currently exist. Safety concerns at the junction of US Highway 41 and Corkscrew Road would present serious drawbacks. Pedestrian/bicycle access to the park from US Highway 41, along Corkscrew Road is currently non-existent and is desperately needed to provide resident access into the park. Any proposal to consider a change in the current park access must take into account traffic speed and flow, the size of vehicles that regularly enter the park as well as the number of vehicles that attend special events. Noise levels and traffic vibration emanating from US Highway 41 have raised concerns for the need for landscaping, fences and walls to protect the cultural resources as well as restore the tranquility of the park setting. The park is willing to work closely with the community with those goals in mind.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments during the process of developing this plan. Strong community support has served Koreshan State Historic Site well during my tenure as Park Manager. I look forward to creating a stronger relationship with the residents of Estero by continuing to work with them.

Sincerely


Jeanne M. Parks
Park Manager

Cc: Michael K. Murphy, Chief, Bureau of Parks, District 4
Gloria M. Sajgo, Principal Planner, Lee County
Bill Grace, President, Koreshan Unity Alliance
file

80327

HUMPHREY & KNOTT

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

1625 HENDRY STREET (33901)
P. O. BOX 2449
FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33902-2449

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722

TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446

MUhle@humphreyandknott.com

THOMAS B. HART
MARK A. HOROWITZ
MATTHEW D. UHLE
H. ANDREW SWETT

DIRECTOR OF ZONING AND
LAND USE PLANNING
MICHAEL E. ROEDER, AICP

JAMES T. HUMPHREY
GEORGE H. KNOTT*†
GEORGE L. CONSOER, JR.**
MARK A. EBELINI
GAREY F. BUTLER

*Board Certified Civil Trial Lawyer
**Board Certified Real Estate Lawyer
†Board Certified Business Litigation Lawyer

September 22, 2000

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

Re: Estero Community Plan

Dear Mitch:

Our firm represents Koreshan Unity Foundation, Inc., the owner of several parcels consisting of approximately 50 acres in an area bounded by Corkscrew Road, Sandy Lane, U.S. 41, and County Road (a local street located north of the river). One of these parcels contains historic resources; the remainder do not. KUF was and is responsible for the preservation of the culture and history of the original Koreshans; this was done, in part, through the donation of 340 acres that is now the state park. KUF is, and always will be, sensitive to the need to protect the historic character of the area.

KUF, like all non-profits, has to generate revenues to pay its bills. To that end, it has reacquired several properties that were formerly owned by the Foundation. These properties do not contain historic resources. We have been working on a very complicated zoning application over the last year that includes both the historic areas and the reacquired parcels in an effort to assist the Foundation to continue to accomplish its goals. The application will be filed September 22nd.

The application is consistent with the overall objectives of your proposed community plan in a variety of ways, including the following:

1. The application is for a mixed-use development which contains residential, commercial, and community facility uses;
2. The plan shows an Estero River Management Zone and Buffer Area with very limited permitted uses;

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

3. The plan contains open space in a percentage that significantly exceeds the requirements in the LDC;
4. The proposal includes a landscape betterment plan for property along Corkscrew Road, Sandy Lane and U.S. 41 with special limitations on signage;
5. The plan is consistent with your general concept of village-style development along Corkscrew Road; and
6. The plan preserves the historic character of the parcel to which you refer as the "Theater in the Woods" tract.

Unfortunately, your proposed community plan contains several policies that are inconsistent with our MCP, including the following:

1. Policy 19.1.2: This policy appears to prohibit the use of landscape betterment plans along Corkscrew Road, which is inconsistent with the County Commission's recent decision to approve them as deviations. It should be deleted.
2. Policy 19.1.6 (shown as 19.1.5): The draft plan does not contain a map showing the "Historic Area," so it is impossible for us to determine the precise impact of this policy on the KUF property. We do not know if the "Highlands Avenue/US 41 area" includes the KUF property located at the intersection of U.S. 41 and County Road. We strongly object to the policy as it is currently written and to any notion that the proposed rezoning should be delayed until a "comprehensive Historic Development Overlay can be developed." Since our MCP protects all of the historic resources on the site, there is no reason to delay the zoning case, particularly since we started working on it even before there was any discussion about a community plan. Please delete the second sentence.
3. Policy 19.2.2: As will be explained more thoroughly at next week's public showing of the Foundation Master Plan, the project hinges on a special case finding. The parcel and the plan contain numerous unusual features that justify the special case finding including, but not limited to, the protection of the "Theater in the Woods" tract from large scale commercial uses in spite of its location at the intersection of two arterials. We do not see how this policy accomplishes your objective of encouraging small-scale, attractive, village-type commercial development along Corkscrew Road. We strongly object to this policy, which should be deleted.

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

4. Policy 19.2.3: This policy should not apply to property that is in the Urban Community FLUM category. Map 19 (which, incidentally, has very limited regulatory significance) does not show a node at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, but the presence of a large shopping center at the southeast corner of that intersection makes it obvious that the subject property is suitable for commercial uses in excess of the minor commercial standard.
5. Policy 19.4.1 The policy is vague and unenforceable by Lee County in that all relevant rules are under the jurisdiction of SFWMD. As such, the policy should be deleted.
6. Policy 19.6.3: We do not intend to "convert" the historic resources on the property to other uses. We are, however, proposing a wide range of residential, commercial, and community facilities uses on the various parcels. The language in this policy is too general to permit us to draw a conclusion as to whether it is consistent with our MCP.

It is my understanding that Greg Stuart will be briefing you on the project on September 25th. We are more than willing to provide you with a copy of our zoning application if you would find it helpful in your review of these issues. We can also provide you with information about the historic resources on the property, and we can even give you a tour of the site if you like. We are concerned, however, that these policies were drafted without any detailed knowledge of the KUF property or of our plan. We do not believe that the plan should go forward with the current policies without additional data and review, along with input from the public including, but not limited to, the Koreshan Unity Foundation.

Sincerely,

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.



Matthew D. Uhle

MDU/dr

cc: Charles Dauray
Greg Stuart
Alan Fields
Paul Schryver

g:\mdu\TEMP\hutch2ltr.

80327

HUMPHREY & KNOTT

JAMES T. HUMPHREY
GEORGE H. KNOTT *†
GEORGE L. CONSOER, JR.**
MARK A. EBELINI
GAREY F. BUTLER

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
1625 HENDRY STREET (33901)
P. O. BOX 2449
FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33902-2449

THOMAS B. HART
MARK A. HOROWITZ
MATTHEW D. UHLE
H. ANDREW SWETT

*Board Certified Civil Trial Lawyer
**Board Certified Real Estate Lawyer
†Board Certified Business Litigation Lawyer

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722

TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446

MUhle@humphreyandknot.com

DIRECTOR OF ZONING AND
LAND USE PLANNING
MICHAEL E. ROEDER, AICP

September 22, 2000

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

RE: Estero Community Plan

Dear Mitch:

Our firm represents John Madden, Trustee, the owner of the parcel west of U.S. 41 that is commonly known as Estero Greens. The property is zoned CPD. The owner is currently seeking development order approval for an automobile dealership on a portion of the 24 acre site. As you are undoubtedly aware, the dealership was the source of considerable controversy, and the issue is in litigation.

The LDC currently provides that planned development zonings are vacated after five years unless the applicant applies for a development order for a "substantial portion" of the project within that time frame. Once the applicant has complied with that requirement, however, the zoning remains in place indefinitely so long as the developer adheres to the phasing schedule, if any, shown on the MCP. Your proposed Policy 19.2.7, however, directs the County to consider the possibility of adopting new regulations which would apparently have the effect of vacating all existing planned developments, even if they have already met all of the current vesting requirements, after five years. When read in connection with proposed Policy 19.2.6, this policy would result in the elimination of the automobile dealership use from the schedule of uses for Estero Greens, which would substantially diminish the value of the property.

There can be no doubt that the purpose of the proposed policy is to divest projects that the County currently considers to be vested. At best, it would only address projects which are merely in the development order process; at worst, it would destroy the effectiveness, not just of vested zonings, but of outstanding development orders as well. It will have a major impact, not just on Estero Greens, but on every planned development in the Estero area. The potential Bert Harris Act liability for the County could be enormous.

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

The County currently has the legal ability to require projects that have been vacated to comply with its most recent regulations. We believe that is as far as the County can, or should, go.

Sincerely,

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.



Matthew D. Uhle

MDU/dr

cc: Rick Marchetta
Greg Stuart
Richard Collman, Esq.
Timothy Jones, Esq.
Paul O'Connor

Bonita Bay Properties, Inc.
3451 Bonita Bay Blvd., Suite 202
Bonita Springs, Florida 34134-4395
Phone: 941-495-1000
Planning & Development Fax: 941-498-1193

FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

Date: 08/24/00

To: Vanasse & Daylor

Fax No.: (941) 437-4636

Attn: Mitch Hutchcraft

From: David Graham

Subject: ECCO

Pages Including Cover Page: 3

(If you have difficulty receiving this transmission, please call Cindy at 390-1152).

*Version
#2*

Pls. top to Mitch.
DEG's Comments.

ESTERO CONCERNED CITIZENS ORGANIZATION (ECCO)

Debraham
8/24

INPUT TO AUGUST 15, 2000 COMMUNITY PLANNING WORKSHOP

COMMUNITY CHARACTER: Estero should feature a distinctive "Residential" appearance. Supporting businesses should fit within and enhance Estero's "Residential Character". To the extent possible Estero should develop as a town, with a town center or town commons, be citizen friendly and encourage a sense of belonging, and become a place where Holiday and "Estero Unique" traditions and celebrations can be encouraged to grow and flourish. In order to achieve and maintain this character, we recommend:

Architectural Standards for Structures

- Establish a Community Based Architectural Standards Review Board
- Define Standards Compatible with Florida Traditional Styles and Surroundings
- Include Building Height Limits
- Include Building Setback Standards
- Encourage "Subdued" Color Schemes
- Limit "box type" Structures Without Architectural Features and Trim

could be too restrictive

Landscaping Standards

- Use "Signature" Plantings of Flowering Plants and Trees
- Utilize Raised Berms
- Distinctive Street Signs, Lamps and Poles, Benches and Bus Shelters
- Place "Welcome to Estero" Signs and Landscaping at Estero Borders
- Implement Roadway Landscaping and Sidewalks/Bike Paths
- Establish Green Areas and Parks

Lighting, Signs, Utilities, Towers and Antennas

- Use Tasteful and Distinctive Lighting, with limits on brightness and coverage
- Define Standards for size, placement, lighting and height limits
- Utilize Buried Utilities along roadways and in residential areas
- Apply Landscaping/Screening Around Telephone/Utility Poles

Commercial Corridor Concepts

- Encourage Retail Concentrations at Major Intersections and in Other Clusters
- Reserve Areas along Commercial Corridors for More Residential Compatible Uses
- Encourage Small Retail Businesses, e.g. Flower Shop, Shoe Repair, Art Gallery, etc.
- Define Building Setbacks in Conjunction with Rear Parking
- Landscape Areas between Roadway and Building Fronts and Parking Lots
- Landscape Roadway Medians
- Limit the Number of Roadway Median Cross Cuts and Accesses from Roadways
- Provide Deceleration and Turn Lanes for New and Existing Businesses
- Encourage Businesses to Implement Appropriate Hours of Operation
- Encourage Lee-Tran Operations within Estero
- Tighten Level of Service (LOS) Requirements for Estero

How?
What is market?

Tighten??

Commercial/Residential Borders

- Substantial Landscaping and Raised Berms Between Commercial and Residential
- Define Setback Minimums
- Require Landscape/Walled Screening of Trash and Outdoor Storage Areas

except in mixed use developments

Recreational Areas and Parks

- _ Develop Youth/Adult Recreation Centers with Active Programs
- _ Develop A Well Planned Estero/Bonita Park
- _ Make Appropriate Use of The Shadav Property *→ (see what?)*
- _ Preserve and Enhance Public Access to The Estero River
- _ Preserve and Enhance CREW Lands/Trails for Public use
- _ Identify Additional Lands for Potential Conversion to Parks/Preserves

Cultural and Historical

- Who?* {
- _ Support The Estero Historical Society
 - _ Support The Koreshan Park and Facilities Restoration
 - _ Support The South County Regional Library
 - _ Develop a Center for the Arts

Community Services

- _ Establish Local Governmental Offices For Essential services in Estero
- _ Establish a Sheriff's Substation in Estero
- _ Provide First rate Fire Protection and EMS/ALS Services for Estero
- _ Identify Lee County, FDOT and Community Development Liasons for Estero
- _ Identify Sites for New Schools and Community Based Educational Programs in Estero
- _ Encourage Community Based Medical/Health Services in Estero

Environmental/Protection of Natural Resources

- ?* {
- _ Confine Required Mitigation to Estero, whenever possible
 - _ Enforce Population Density Standards
 - _ Implement Setback Standards From The Estero River and Estero Bay
 - _ Preserve The Watershed Areas East of I-75 *→ too vague*
 - _ Study Potential Effect of "Shared Adversity" by SFWMD on Estero
 - _ Define and Implement Noise Standards *→ meaning?*

List of Undesirable Businesses

- _ "Sin"-Related/Adult Entertainment Related Businesses or Activity
- _ Bottle Club Establishments
- _ Establishments Where the Sale of Alcoholic Beverages is Predominant
- _ Businesses which use large outdoor areas for Sales and Inventory Storage

Development Approval Process

- _ Provide Early Notification of Public via Notice Placed on Site, Notice in the Media, Notice on County Website, and Notice to Registered Organizations and Citizens of Application for Rezoning.
- _ Applicant to provide information which clearly describes specific intended land and/or building use and the intended timeframe for project implementation.
- _ Conduct all Public Workshops and Hearings Within the Estero Community.
- _ Require a Community Workshop open to the Public between the Applicant, County Staff and Community Organizations and Citizens.
- _ Distinguish between "persons being paid to influence public decisions" and "citizens and/or citizens organizations" when limiting communications with County Staff and County Commissioners regarding property and land use decisions.

Not workable

men/issue1 (15Aug00)

This is dangerous - could preclude all business people

Bonita Bay Properties, Inc.
3451 Bonita Bay Blvd., Suite 202
Bonita Springs, Florida 34134-4395
Phone: 941-495-1000
Planning & Development Fax: 941-498-1193

FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

Date: 7/3/00

To: **Vanasse & Daylor** Fax No.: **(941) 437-4636**

Attn: **Mitch Hutchcraft**

From: **David Graham**

Subject: **ECCO**

Pages Including Cover Page: 3

(If you have difficulty receiving this transmission, please call Cindy at 390-1152).

~~Cc: [unclear]~~
Pls. fax to
Mitch Van
DB 8/21
8/21

cc. DEG
ME
KG
SAW

August 16, 2000

TO: David Graham, (with attachment)
Eddie Perri, (with attachment)
Meg Venceller, (with attachment)
Frank Weed, (with attachment)

D Church
J Gleason

CC: Don Eslick (w/o attachment)
Mitch Hutchcraft (w/o attachment)

Comments?

Need to get
feedback to
Mitch ASAP.

Dear Fellow Committee Members,

I hope each of you will be interested in the input (copy attached)
provided by ECCO to the Estero Visioning and Planning Effort. This has
already been provided to Mitch in both hard copy and in digital format.

DB
8/20

Regards,

Neal
Neal Noethlich
20225 Wildcat Run Drive
Estero, FL 33928

Tel: 495-6698
email: nen13@aol.com

✓ Cindy - New Files

- 1) "Estero Community Plan" 23a
- 2) "East River" Community Plan 236

RECEIVED

BONITA BAY
PROPERTIES, INC.

ESTERO CONCERNED CITIZENS ORGANIZATION (ECCO)

INPUT TO AUGUST 15, 2000 COMMUNITY PLANNING WORKSHOP

COMMUNITY CHARACTER: Estero should feature a distinctive "Residential" appearance. Supporting businesses should fit within and enhance Estero's "Residential Character". To the extent possible Estero should develop as a town, with a town center or town commons, be citizen friendly and encourage a sense of belonging, and become a place where Holiday and "Estero Unique" traditions and celebrations can be encouraged to grow and flourish. In order to achieve and maintain this character, we recommend:

Architectural Standards for Structures

- Establish a Community Based Architectural Standards Review Board
- Define Standards Compatible with Florida Traditional Styles and Surroundings
- Include Building Height Limits
- Include Building Setback Standards
- Encourage "Subdued" Color Schemes
- Limit "box type" Structures Without Architectural Features and Trim

Landscaping Standards

- Use "Signature" Plantings of Flowering Plants and Trees
- Utilize Raised Berms *and landscape strips to buffer buildings & parking.*
- Distinctive Street Signs, Lamps and Poles, Benches and Bus Shelters
- Place "Welcome to Estero" Signs and Landscaping at Estero Borders
- Implement Roadway Landscaping and Sidewalks/Bike Paths
- Establish Green Areas and Parks

Lighting, Signs, Utilities, Towers and Antennas

- Use Tasteful and Distinctive Lighting, with limits on brightness and coverage
- Define Standards for size, placement, lighting and height limits
- Utilize Buried Utilities along roadways and in residential areas
- Apply Landscaping/Screening Around Telephone/Utility Poles

Commercial Corridor Concepts

- Encourage Retail Concentrations at Major Intersections and in Other Clusters
- Reserve Areas along Commercial Corridors for More Residential Compatible Uses
- Encourage Small Retail Businesses, e.g. Flower Shop, Shoe Repair, Art Gallery, etc.
- Define Building Setbacks in Conjunction with Rear Parking
- Landscape Areas between Roadway and Building Fronts and Parking Lots
- Landscape Roadway Medians
- Limit the Number of Roadway Median Cross Cuts and Accesses from Roadways
- Provide Deceleration and Turn Lanes for New and Existing Businesses
- Encourage Businesses to Implement Appropriate Hours of Operation
- Encourage LeeTran Operations within Estero
- Tighten Level of Service (LOS) Requirements for Estero

Commercial/Residential Borders

- Substantial Landscaping and Raised Berms Between Commercial and Residential
- Define Setback Minimums
- Require Landscape/Walled Screening of Trash and Outdoor Storage Areas

Consider RR corridor for future trail

May be cost prohibitive along major arteries.

Integrate bicycle & pedestrian paths/trails

Page 2

Recreational Areas and Parks

- Develop Youth/Adult Recreation Centers with Active Programs
- Develop A Well Planned Estero/Bonita Park
- Make Appropriate Use of The Shadev Property
- Preserve and Enhance Public Access to The Estero River
- Preserve and Enhance CREW Lands/Trails for Public use
- Identify Additional Lands for Potential Conversion to Parks/Preserves

Cultural and Historical

- Support The Estero Historical Society
- Support The Koreshan Park and Facilities Restoration
- Support The South County Regional Library
- Develop a Center for the Arts

Community Services

- Establish Local Governmental Offices For Essential services in Estero
- Establish a Sheriff's Substation in Estero
- Provide First rate Fire Protection and EMS/ALS Services for Estero
- Identify Lee County, FDOT and Community Development Liasons for Estero
- Identify Sites for New Schools and Community Based Educational Programs in Estero
- Encourage Community Based Medical/Health Services in Estero

Plan all community facilities first w/ approval locations.

Environmental/Protection of Natural Resources

- Confine Required Mitigation to Estero, whenever possible
- Enforce Population Density Standards
- Implement Setback Standards From The Estero River and Estero Bay
- Preserve The Watershed Areas East of I-75
- Study Potential Effect of "Shared Adversity" by SFWMD on Estero
- Define and Implement Noise Standards

List of Undesirable Businesses

- "Sin"-Related/Adult Entertainment Related Businesses or Activity
- Bottle Club Establishments
- Establishments Where the Sale of Alcoholic Beverages is Predominant
- Businesses which use large outdoor areas for Sales and Inventory Storage

Development Approval Process

- Provide Early Notification of Public via Notice Placed on Site, Notice in the Media, Notice on County Website, and Notice to Registered Organizations and Citizens of Application for Rezoning.
- Applicant to provide information which clearly describes specific intended land and/or building use and the intended timeframe for project implementation.
- Conduct all Public Workshops and Hearings Within the Estero Community.
- Require a Community Workshop open to the Public between the Applicant, County Staff and Community Organizations and Citizens.
- Distinguish between "persons being paid to influence public decisions" and "citizens and/or citizens organizations" when limiting communications with County Staff and County Commissioners regarding property and land use decisions.

nen/issue1 (15Aug00)

ESTERO CONCERNED CITIZENS ORGANIZATION (ECCO)

INPUT TO AUGUST 15, 2000 COMMUNITY PLANNING WORKSHOP

COMMUNITY CHARACTER: Estero should feature a distinctive "Residential" appearance. Supporting businesses should fit within and enhance Estero's "Residential Character". To the extent possible Estero should develop as a town, with a town center or town commons, be citizen friendly and encourage a sense of belonging, and become a place where Holiday and "Estero Unique" traditions and celebrations can be encouraged to grow and flourish. In order to achieve and maintain this character, we recommend:

Architectural Standards for Structures

- Establish a Community Based Architectural Standards Review Board
- Define Standards Compatible with Florida Traditional Styles and Surroundings
- Include Building Height Limits
- Include Building Setback Standards
- Encourage "Subdued" Color Schemes
- Limit "box type" Structures Without Architectural Features and Trim

Landscaping Standards

- Use "Signature" Plantings of Flowering Plants and Trees
- Utilize Raised Berms
- Distinctive Street Signs, Lamps and Poles, Benches and Bus Shelters
- Place "Welcome to Estero" Signs and Landscaping at Estero Borders
- Implement Roadway Landscaping and Sidewalks/Bike Paths
- Establish Green Areas and Parks

Lighting, Signs, Utilities, Towers and Antennas

- Use Tasteful and Distinctive Lighting, with limits on brightness and coverage
- Define Standards for size, placement, lighting and height limits
- Utilize Buried Utilities along roadways and in residential areas
- Apply Landscaping/Screening Around Telephone/Utility Poles

Commercial Corridor Concepts

- Encourage Retail Concentrations at Major Intersections and in Other Clusters
- Reserve Areas along Commercial Corridors for More Residential Compatible Uses
- Encourage Small Retail Businesses, e.g. Flower Shop, Shoe Repair, Art Gallery, etc.
- Define Building Setbacks in Conjunction with Rear Parking
- Landscape Areas between Roadway and Building Fronts and Parking Lots
- Landscape Roadway Medians
- Limit the Number of Roadway Median Cross Cuts and Accesses from Roadways
- Provide Deceleration and Turn Lanes for New and Existing Businesses
- Encourage Businesses to Implement Appropriate Hours of Operation
- Encourage LeeTran Operations within Estero
- Tighten Level of Service (LOS) Requirements for Estero

Commercial/Residential Borders

- Substantial Landscaping and Raised Berms Between Commercial and Residential
- Define Setback Minimums
- Require Landscape/Walled Screening of Trash and Outdoor Storage Areas

Recreational Areas and Parks

- _ Develop Youth/Adult Recreation Centers with Active Programs
- _ Develop A Well Planned Estero/Bonita Park
- _ Make Appropriate Use of The Shadev Property
- _ Preserve and Enhance Public Access to The Estero River
- _ Preserve and Enhance CREW Lands/Trails for Public use
- _ Identify Additional Lands for Potential Conversion to Parks/Preserves

Cultural and Historical

- _ Support The Estero Historical Society
- _ Support The Koreshan Park and Facilities Restoration
- _ Support The South County Regional Library
- _ Develop a Center for the Arts

Community Services

- _ Establish Local Governmental Offices For Essential services in Estero
- _ Establish a Sheriff's Substation in Estero
- _ Provide First rate Fire Protection and EMS/ALS Services for Estero
- _ Identify Lee County, FDOT and Community Development Liasons for Estero
- _ Identify Sites for New Schools and Community Based Educational Programs in Estero
- _ Encourage Community Based Medical/Health Services in Estero

Environmental/Protection of Natural Resources

- _ Confine Required Mitigation to Estero, whenever possible
- _ Enforce Population Density Standards
- _ Implement Setback Standards From The Estero River and Estero Bay
- _ Preserve The Watershed Areas East of I-75
- _ Study Potential Effect of "Shared Adversity" by SFWMD on Estero
- _ Define and Implement Noise Standards

List of Undesirable Businesses

- _ "Sin"-Related/Adult Entertainment Related Businesses or Activity
- _ Bottle Club Establishments
- _ Establishments Where the Sale of Alcoholic Beverages is Predominant
- _ Businesses which use large outdoor areas for Sales and Inventory Storage

Development Approval Process

- _ Provide Early Notification of Public via Notice Placed on Site, Notice in the Media, Notice on County Website, and Notice to Registered Organizations and Citizens of Application for Rezoning.
- _ Applicant to provide information which clearly describes specific intended land and/or building use and the intended timeframe for project implementation.
- _ Conduct all Public Workshops and Hearings Within the Estero Community.
- _ Require a Community Workshop open to the Public between the Applicant, County Staff and Community Organizations and Citizens.
- _ Distinguish between "persons being paid to influence public decisions" and "citizens and/or citizens organizations" when limiting communications with County Staff and County Commissioners regarding property and land use decisions.

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING MEETING COMMENT/PARTICIPATION CARD

08/15/00 MEETING AT THE LEE COUNTY SOUTH COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME(S): MATT VALE PHONE NO: (941) 334-2722

MAILING ADDRESS: 1625 HENDRY ST.

FT. MYERS FL 33902
(city) (state) (zip code)

E-MAIL ADDRESS: MVALE@HUMPHREYANDKNOTT.COM

AFFILIATION: REPRESENTING JOHN MADSEN, M.V. 07EE

COMMENTS: SECTION 1 CAN MUST PROTECT VESTED COMMERCIAL

PROJECTS, SUCH AS ESTERO GREENS (OWNED BY MADSEN, M.V. 07EE)

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING MEETING COMMENT/PARTICIPATION CARD

08/15/00 MEETING AT THE LEE COUNTY SOUTH COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME(S): MARILYN DONALDSON PHONE NO: 947-5635

MAILING ADDRESS: 4936 ROYAL PALM

ESTERO FL 33928
(city) (state) (zip code)

E-MAIL ADDRESS: RPLONDO@AOL.COM

AFFILIATION: CHAMBER - ECCO - CIVIC AFFAIRS

COMMENTS: _____

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING MEETING COMMENT/PARTICIPATION CARD

08/15/00 MEETING AT THE LEE COUNTY SOUTH COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME(S): NELLIE J. MARIANO (JUD) PHONE NO: 495-2072

MAILING ADDRESS: 1571 E. BLUE HAVEN RD. # 1112

ESTERO FL 33428
(city) (state) (zip code)

E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____

AFFILIATION: _____

COMMENTS: _____

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING MEETING COMMENT/PARTICIPATION CARD

08/15/00 MEETING AT THE LEE COUNTY SOUTH COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME(S): BARBARA AKINS PHONE NO: 948-0305

MAILING ADDRESS: 3609 GLENWATER LN

Bonita Dge FL 34134
(city) (state) (zip code)

E-MAIL ADDRESS: AKINSBS@AOL.COM

AFFILIATION: _____

COMMENTS: _____

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING MEETING COMMENT/PARTICIPATION CARD

08/15/00 MEETING AT THE LEE COUNTY SOUTH COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME(S): Gene Gator PHONE NO: 992-3396

MAILING ADDRESS: 50131 Cobblestone Ct.

Estero Fl 33928-2697
(city) (state) (zip code)

E-MAIL ADDRESS: gator@estero.com

AFFILIATION: None

COMMENTS: _____

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING MEETING COMMENT/PARTICIPATION CARD

08/15/00 MEETING AT THE LEE COUNTY SOUTH COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME(S): ByRON M. HALLAM PHONE NO: (941) 909-2094

MAILING ADDRESS: 3450 SEARS CRUIT LN

ESTERO FL 33928
(city) (state) (zip code)

E-MAIL ADDRESS: bhallam@att.net

AFFILIATION: None

COMMENTS: None

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING MEETING COMMENT/PARTICIPATION CARD

08/15/00 MEETING AT THE LEE COUNTY SOUTH COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME(S): FILED CALVIN PHONE NO: 947-4471

MAILING ADDRESS: 20934 Country Bess Dr

Estero FL 33928
(city) (state) (zip code)

E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____

AFFILIATION: _____

COMMENTS: _____

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING MEETING COMMENT/PARTICIPATION CARD

08/15/00 MEETING AT THE LEE COUNTY SOUTH COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY

(Please Print Legibly)

NAME(S): NEAL NOETHLICH PHONE NO: 495-6698

MAILING ADDRESS: 20225 WILDCAT RUN DRIVE

ESTERO FL 33928
(city) (state) (zip code)

E-MAIL ADDRESS: NEN13@aol.com

AFFILIATION: ECCO, CHAMBER, CIVIC ASSN, CRSA, WILDCAT RUN

COMMENTS: _____

LEE COUNTY ORDINANCE NO. 01-__

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE "LEE PLAN" AS ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 89-02, AS AMENDED, SO AS TO ADOPT THAT AMENDMENT KNOWN LOCALLY AS CPA 2000-19 APPROVED IN CONJUNCTION WITH ADOPTION OF LEE COUNTY'S 2000/2001 REGULAR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CYCLE; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE ADOPTED TEXT AND MAPS; PROVIDING FOR PURPOSE AND SHORT TITLE; PROVIDING FOR ADOPTION OF THE SPECIFIED AMENDMENT TO THE LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; PROVIDING FOR THE LEGAL EFFECT OF "THE LEE PLAN"; PROVIDING FOR GEOGRAPHICAL APPLICABILITY; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, CODIFICATION, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Lee County Comprehensive Plan (hereinafter referred to as the "Lee Plan") Policy 2.4.1 and Chapter XIII, provides for adoption of Plan Amendments with such frequency as may be permitted by applicable state statutes, in accordance with such administrative procedures as the Board of County Commissioners may adopt; and,

WHEREAS, the Lee County Board of County Commissioners, in accordance with Section 163.3181, Florida Statutes, and Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-6 further provides an opportunity for individuals to participate in the plan amendment public hearing process; and,

WHEREAS, the Lee County Local Planning Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "LPA") held statutorily prescribed public hearings pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, and Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-6 on June 25, 2001 and July 23, 2001; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners, pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, and Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-6, held a statutorily prescribed public hearing for the transmittal of the proposed amendments on August 29, 2001, and at that hearing approved a motion to send, and did later send, the proposed

amendments to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (hereinafter referred to as "DCA") for review and comment pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes; and,

WHEREAS, at the August 29, 2001 meeting, pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, the Board of County Commissioners did announce its intention to hold a public hearing after the receipt of DCA's written comments commonly referred to as the "ORC Report," which were later received on November 21, 2001 by the Chairman of the Lee County Board of County Commissioners; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners during its statutorily prescribed public hearing for the plan amendments on January 10, 2002, moved to adopt the proposed amendments as more particularly set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA, THAT:

SECTION ONE: PURPOSE, INTENT AND SHORT TITLE

The Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Florida, in compliance with Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, and with Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-6, has conducted a series of public hearings to review the proposed amendments to the Lee Plan. The purpose of this ordinance is to adopt those amendments to the Lee Plan discussed at those meetings and approved by an absolute majority of the Board of County Commissioners. The short title and proper reference for the Lee County Comprehensive Plan, as hereby amended, will continue to be the "Lee Plan." This ordinance may be referred to as the "2000/2001 Regular Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle CPA 2000-19 Ordinance."

SECTION TWO: ADOPTION OF LEE COUNTY'S 2000/2001 REGULAR
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CYCLE

The Lee County Board of County Commissioners hereby amends the existing Lee Plan, adopted by Ordinance Number 89-02, as amended, by adopting amendments, as revised by the Board of County Commissioners on January 10, 2002, known as CPA 2000-19, which amend the text of the Lee Plan as well as the Future Land Use Map series of the Lee Plan.

In addition, the above-mentioned Staff Report and Analysis, along with all attachments for this amendment are hereby adopted as "Support Documentation" for the Lee County Comprehensive Plan.

SECTION THREE: LEGAL EFFECT OF THE "LEE PLAN"

No public or private development will be permitted except in conformity with the Lee Plan. All land development regulations and land development orders shall be consistent with the Lee Plan as so amended.

SECTION FOUR: GEOGRAPHIC APPLICABILITY

The Lee Plan is applicable throughout the unincorporated area of Lee County, Florida, except in those unincorporated areas included in any joint or interlocal agreements with other local governments that specifically provide otherwise.

SECTION FIVE: SEVERABILITY

The provisions of this ordinance are severable and it is the intention of the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Florida, to confer the whole or any part of the powers herein provided. If any of the provisions of this ordinance are held unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, the decision of that court will not affect or impair

remaining provisions of this ordinance. It is hereby declared to be the legislative intent of the Board of County Commissioners that this ordinance would have been adopted had such unconstitutional provisions not been included therein.

SECTION SIX: INCLUSION IN CODE, CODIFICATION, SCRIVENERS' ERROR

It is the intention of the Board of County Commissioners that the provisions of this ordinance will become and be made a part of the Lee County Code. Sections of this ordinance may be renumbered or relettered and the word "ordinance" may be changed to "section," "article," or such other appropriate word or phrase in order to accomplish such intention; and regardless of whether such inclusion in the code is accomplished, sections of this ordinance may be renumbered or relettered. The correction of typographical errors that do not affect the intent, may be authorized by the County Manager, or his or her designee, without need of public hearing, by filing a corrected or recodified copy with the Clerk of the Circuit Court.

SECTION SEVEN: EFFECTIVE DATE

The plan amendments adopted herein are not effective until a final order is issued by the DCA or Administration Commission finding the amendment in compliance with Section 163.3184, Florida Statutes, whichever occurs earlier. No development orders, development permits, or land uses dependent on this amendment may be issued or commence before it has become effective. If a final order of noncompliance is issued by the Administration Commission, this amendment may nevertheless be made effective by adoption of a resolution affirming its effective status, a copy of which resolution will be sent to the DCA, Bureau of Local Planning, 2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100.

THE FOREGOING ORDINANCE was offered by Commissioner ___ who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner ___ and, when put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

JOHN MANNING _____
DOUGLAS ST. CERNY _____
RAY JUDAH _____
ANDREW COY _____
JOHN ALBION _____

DONE AND ADOPTED this 10th day of January, 2002.

ATTEST:
CHARLIE GREEN, CLERK

LEE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

BY: _____
Deputy Clerk

BY: _____
Chairman

DATE: _____

Approved as to form by:

County Attorney's Office

LEE COUNTY ORDINANCE NO. 02-05

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE "LEE PLAN" AS ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 89-02, AS AMENDED, SO AS TO ADOPT THAT AMENDMENT KNOWN LOCALLY AS CPA 2000-19 APPROVED IN CONJUNCTION WITH ADOPTION OF LEE COUNTY'S 2000/2001 REGULAR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CYCLE; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE ADOPTED TEXT AND MAPS; PROVIDING FOR PURPOSE AND SHORT TITLE; PROVIDING FOR ADOPTION OF THE SPECIFIED AMENDMENT TO THE LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; PROVIDING FOR THE LEGAL EFFECT OF "THE LEE PLAN"; PROVIDING FOR GEOGRAPHICAL APPLICABILITY; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, CODIFICATION, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Lee County Comprehensive Plan (hereinafter referred to as the "Lee Plan") Policy 2.4.1 and Chapter XIII, provides for adoption of Plan Amendments with such frequency as may be permitted by applicable state statutes, in accordance with such administrative procedures as the Board of County Commissioners may adopt; and,

WHEREAS, the Lee County Board of County Commissioners, in accordance with Section 163.3181, Florida Statutes, and Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-6 further provides an opportunity for individuals to participate in the plan amendment public hearing process; and,

WHEREAS, the Lee County Local Planning Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "LPA") held statutorily prescribed public hearings pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, and Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-6 on June 25, 2001 and July 23, 2001; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners, pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, and Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-6, held a statutorily prescribed public hearing for the transmittal of the proposed amendments on August 29, 2001, and at that hearing approved a motion to send, and did later send, the proposed

amendments to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (hereinafter referred to as "DCA") for review and comment pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes; and,

WHEREAS, at the August 29, 2001 meeting, pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, the Board of County Commissioners did announce its intention to hold a public hearing after the receipt of DCA's written comments commonly referred to as the "ORC Report," which were later received on November 21, 2001 by the Chairman of the Lee County Board of County Commissioners; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners during its statutorily prescribed public hearing for the plan amendments on January 10, 2002, moved to adopt the proposed amendments as more particularly set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA, THAT:

SECTION ONE: PURPOSE, INTENT AND SHORT TITLE

The Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Florida, in compliance with Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, and with Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-6, has conducted a series of public hearings to review the proposed amendments to the Lee Plan. The purpose of this ordinance is to adopt those amendments to the Lee Plan discussed at those meetings and approved by an absolute majority of the Board of County Commissioners. The short title and proper reference for the Lee County Comprehensive Plan, as hereby amended, will continue to be the "Lee Plan." This ordinance may be referred to as the "2000/2001 Regular Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle CPA 2000-19 Ordinance."

SECTION TWO: ADOPTION OF LEE COUNTY'S 2000/2001 REGULAR
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CYCLE

The Lee County Board of County Commissioners hereby amends the existing Lee Plan, adopted by Ordinance Number 89-02, as amended, by adopting amendments, as revised by the Board of County Commissioners on January 10, 2002, known as CPA 2000-19, which amend the text of the Lee Plan as well as the Future Land Use Map series of the Lee Plan.

In addition, the above-mentioned Staff Report and Analysis, along with all attachments for this amendment are hereby adopted as "Support Documentation" for the Lee County Comprehensive Plan.

SECTION THREE: LEGAL EFFECT OF THE "LEE PLAN"

No public or private development will be permitted except in conformity with the Lee Plan. All land development regulations and land development orders shall be consistent with the Lee Plan as so amended.

SECTION FOUR: GEOGRAPHIC APPLICABILITY

The Lee Plan is applicable throughout the unincorporated area of Lee County, Florida, except in those unincorporated areas included in any joint or interlocal agreements with other local governments that specifically provide otherwise.

SECTION FIVE: SEVERABILITY

The provisions of this ordinance are severable and it is the intention of the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Florida, to confer the whole or any part of the powers herein provided. If any of the provisions of this ordinance are held unconstitutional

by a court of competent jurisdiction, the decision of that court will not affect or impair remaining provisions of this ordinance. It is hereby declared to be the legislative intent of the Board of County Commissioners that this ordinance would have been adopted had such unconstitutional provisions not been included therein.

SECTION SIX: INCLUSION IN CODE, CODIFICATION, SCRIVENERS' ERROR

It is the intention of the Board of County Commissioners that the provisions of this ordinance will become and be made a part of the Lee County Code. Sections of this ordinance may be renumbered or relettered and the word "ordinance" may be changed to "section," "article," or such other appropriate word or phrase in order to accomplish such intention; and regardless of whether such inclusion in the code is accomplished, sections of this ordinance may be renumbered or relettered. The correction of typographical errors that do not affect the intent, may be authorized by the County Manager, or his or her designee, without need of public hearing, by filing a corrected or recodified copy with the Clerk of the Circuit Court.

SECTION SEVEN: EFFECTIVE DATE

The plan amendments adopted herein are not effective until a final order is issued by the DCA or Administration Commission finding the amendment in compliance with Section 163.3184, Florida Statutes, whichever occurs earlier. No development orders, development permits, or land uses dependent on this amendment may be issued or commence before it has become effective. If a final order of noncompliance is issued by the Administration Commission, this amendment may nevertheless be made effective by adoption of a resolution affirming its effective status, a copy of which resolution will be sent to the DCA, Bureau of Local Planning, 2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100.

THE FOREGOING ORDINANCE was offered by Commissioner Judah who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner St. Cerny and, when put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| ROBERT JANES | <u>AYE</u> |
| DOUGLAS ST. CERNY | <u>AYE</u> |
| RAY JUDAH | <u>AYE</u> |
| ANDREW COY | <u>ABSENT</u> |
| JOHN ALBION | <u>AYE</u> |

DONE AND ADOPTED this 10th day of January, 2002.

ATTEST:
CHARLIE GREEN, CLERK

LEE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

BY: *Patricia Higgins*
Deputy Clerk

BY: *[Signature]*
Chairman

DATE: January 10, 2002

Approved as to form by:

[Signature]
County Attorney's Office



PLANNING DIVISION

M E M O R A N D U M



LEE COUNTY

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA

to: Local Planning Agency Members
from: Paul O'Connor, AICP, Director of Planning
subject: CPA 2000-19, Estero Community Plan
date: July 18, 2001

At the June 25, 2001 meeting of the Local Planning Agency, the LPA voted to transmit the majority of the amendment for the Estero Community Plan. Several items from this amendment, however, were tabled for further consideration. Staff has reexamined those items and offers the following recommendations for the LPA to consider at the July 23, 2001 public hearing.

PROPOSED POLICY 19.2.5

Staff's Recommended Language from the June 25th Hearing:

Policy 19.2.5: Lee County prohibits "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code), free-standing nightclubs or lounges, retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre, and storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

The LPA tabled this particular policy so that staff could clarify several issues.

"Lounges" are not a defined term in the Land Development Code (LDC). Staff believes that references to specific uses in the Lee Plan should correspond to the terminology provided in the LDC. The LDC specifically defines the term "bar and cocktail lounge," and staff recommends using this terminology in Policy 19.2.5. The term "nightclub" is also specifically defined in the Land Development Code. This term is different from "bar and cocktail lounge," and should be treated as such in the proposed policy language.

An issue was raised at the June 25th hearing about the existing or pending projects that might be made non-conforming if this policy is adopted. Staff conducted a cursory review of approved commercial planned developments in Estero, some of which are developed, but many of which are still vacant. In reviewing the list of uses approved in these projects, staff found that many of them contained uses that would be prohibited by this new policy. These uses include, but are not limited to Contractors and Builders, Rental or Leasing Establishments, Vehicle and Equipment Dealers, Bar and Cocktail Lounges, and Nightclubs. The LPA questioned what would happen to these approved uses if this new policy was adopted.

In response, staff believes that Chapter XIII, *Procedures and Administration*, Item a., *Effect and Legal Status of the Plan* addresses this issue. Item D. reads as follows:

D. In addition to above-mentioned development orders, preliminary and final development orders, the following categories of approvals, projects, and developments will be deemed to be consistent with the Lee Plan, subject to the applicable conditions as set forth below:

Item 7 under this heading specifically addresses the issue of how to deal with uses approved within planned developments that might be inconsistent with this new policy.

7. "planned development" zoning approvals which have not been vacated due to inactivity by the developer;

Staff believes that if a development was previously approved in Estero for any of the uses that would be subject to the proposed Policy 19.2.5, then those uses would remain consistent with the Lee Plan because of the policy shown above. Any planned developments that are already approved for these uses would be legally non-conforming if this policy was adopted. If the planned development zoning is vacated, then the provisions in Item D.7. above would not apply, and the development would be subject to the new provisions of Policy 19.2.5.

As a side note, staff believes that the proposed Policy 19.2.5 might not have the effect that the Estero group is seeking. While the policy will prohibit freestanding bar and cocktail lounges as well as night clubs, it would not prohibit them from locating in a shopping center or plaza. In staff's experience, there are very few new freestanding bars or night clubs being established anywhere in the County. These establishments are generally found in shopping centers. This is not an item of concern to staff, but it should be pointed out for the record.

Staff is also concerned about the creation of a new policy in the Lee Plan to strictly prohibit certain uses without having any data and analysis to support it. Staff believes that in the absence of data and analysis, the creation of this policy appears to be arbitrary and not based on sound planning principles.

Revised Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that if Policy 19.2.5 is to be transmitted, the following language should be used. Changes made since the June 25th meeting are shown in strike-out and double underline format.

Policy 19.2.5: ~~The Estero Community will propose regulations for Lee County to review, amend or adopt that prohibits~~ The following uses are prohibited within the Estero Planning Community: "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land

Development Code); free-standing nightclubs or bar and cocktail lounges; or and retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre., and storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was lengthy discussion at the June 25 hearing about the proposed objective and policies relating to public participation. At that time, staff made the following recommendation on the proposed public participation language:

Staff's Recommended Language from June 25th Hearing:

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County shall will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, and zoning approvals, and development orders.

~~**Policy 19.5.1:** Lee County shall register groups within the Estero Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, development code amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates.~~

~~**Policy 19.5.2:** Lee County shall establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available.~~

~~**Policy 19.5.3:** The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Community, in coordination with zoning staff, shall must conduct one public workshop within two weeks of the project being found sufficient.~~

Staff has revisited these policies since the last LPA meeting, and is still not comfortable with placing all of these requirements in the Lee Plan. With regard to Policy 19.5.1, staff believes that providing notification on all ordinances and "development approvals" would require a significant increase in the County's level of service. The volume of ordinances and "development approvals" that the County deals with on a daily basis is so large that it would not be practical to send written notification on all of these items. On the other hand, staff believes that some form of notification for Lee Plan and Land Development Code amendments would be feasible. Staff would be willing to send a copy of an agenda to registered groups, and if these groups wanted more information on

any particular item, then they could contact the County for further information. Currently, staff provides such information to any interested parties on request, and staff is somewhat hesitant to take the lead in determining which items the Estero Community would want to examine in more detail. Typically, staff would respond to a citizen request for information, but would not initiate the distribution of this information. Staff would be willing to notify registered groups on selected items or issues, such as Lee Plan and Land Development Code amendments, but could not do so for every ordinance or "development approval." Staff would do this as a courtesy only.

With regard to Policy 19.5.2, there is still some uncertainty as to what items would be sent to the document clearing house. Staff believes that the intent of the Estero Planning Group was for this policy to apply to documents related to rezonings in Estero. Typically, a zoning file contains several versions of the same documents, all of which add up to large volumes of paperwork. Staff believes that the most appropriate thing to do would be to send only the original submittal documents to the clearing house. This would give the Estero residents a comprehensive overview of the proposed project.

The Estero Planning Group has suggested the South County Regional Library as a potential location for this document clearing house. Staff believes that the library would be a logical place for the clearing house, but staff is still concerned about what will happen to the documents that the County would send to the library. There are no assurances that the library is willing to accept these materials, and there are no assurances that the library is willing to put forth a continuing effort to catalog and shelve the zoning materials. Staff is not comfortable with assuming that the library will be willing to take on this additional responsibility. If the LPA decides to transmit Policy 19.5.2, staff has proposed transmittal language below.

The proposed Policy 19.5.3 addresses the public workshop that would be conducted by the agent handling a rezoning request. The main concern from staff is that procedures for this "public workshop" are not specifically defined. There are many uncertainties and questions that need to be answered. Do the workshops need to be advertised? Do minutes need to be kept? Where will the workshop take place, and who will arrange the location? What are the agent's responsibilities at these workshops? What if no citizens are interested in attending the workshop? Staff is not opposed to the requirements of Policy 19.5.3, but staff also believes that these uncertainties will need to be addressed as these public workshops are conducted in the future. Staff recommends transmittal of this policy, with the language provided by staff below. Staff further recommends that the issues related to this proposed policy continue to be examined for possible consideration in future amendment cycles.

Revised Staff Recommendation:

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County ~~shall~~ will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, Land

Development Code provisions, Lee Plan provisions ~~—policies, and zoning approvals, and development orders.~~

Policy 19.5.1: As a courtesy, Lee County shall will register citizen groups and civic organizations within the Estero Planning Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the County's failure to mail or to timely mail the notice, or failure of a group to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.2: ~~Lee County shall~~ The Estero Community will establish a “document clearing house” in the Estero Community, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or and resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available. The County's failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the document clearing house, or failure of the document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Planning Community, in coordination with zoning staff, shall must conduct one public workshop informational session where the agent will provide a general overview of the project for any interested citizens. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops. This meeting must be conducted within thirty (30) days after the zoning request is submitted two weeks of the project being found sufficient. The applicant is fully responsible for providing the meeting space and providing security measures as needed. Subsequent to this meeting, the applicant must provide County staff with a meeting summary document that contains the following information: the date, time, and location of the meeting; a list of attendees; a summary of the concerns or issues that were raised at the meeting; and a proposal for how the applicant will respond to any issues that were raised.

From: Donna Marie Collins
To: Jones, Timothy; Noble, Matthew
Date: 6/8/01 3:00PM
Subject: Re: Estero Plan Proposed Policy 19.3.4

Matt

In my opinion the requested Lee Plan policy 19.3.4 for Estero is both redundant and ambiguous. It is redundant as to properties located in the V zone because existing Lee Plan policy 80.1.2 addresses this issue.

It is ambiguous because it is not clear whether "hazard area" is intended to include areas outside of the V zone such as the low lying A zones.

If the Estero Community desires to discourage new or expanding MH and RV parks in the low lying A zones as well, then the policy must be amplified to include more detail. For example, "No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD where it is in a V zone or an area subject to flooding during a Category 1 or 2 hurricane event.

I am not concerned about potential conflicts with 34-784 since it can always be amended to include MH parks in Estero.

Housing discrimination problems? I don't think so. I checked the Florida Statutes and did not find anything of note. As long as there is a good HSW reason to keep residences out of the areas subject to flood inundation, you should be ok with this.

Peace.
dmc

Donna Marie Collins
Assistant County Attorney
Lee County Attorney's Office
Phone: 941-335-2236
Fax: 941-335-2606
Email: collinsd@leegov.com

>>> Matthew Noble 05/31/01 01:22PM >>>
Tim, DMC,

Planning staff would appreciate any comments you have concerning the following proposed Lee Plan Policy:

Policy 19.3.4: No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD where it is in high hazard areas in accordance with section 34-784 of the Land Development Code.

Planning staff questions the appropriateness of adding this policy given 34-784 and Lee Plan Policy 80.1.2. The proposed policy is not consistent with these provisions, for example, an argument could be made that the proposed policy expands the restrictions to the entire hazard area not just the V zone, also includes MHPD even though 34-784 does not include mobile homes...any thoughts...any housing discrimination problems...

Thanks!

PLANNING DIVISION



MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Noble, AICP, Principal Planner

From: Gloria M. Sajgo, AICP, Principal Planner 

Subject: Comments on the Preliminary Draft of the Estero Community Plan

Date: September 20, 2000

Page 9 the purpose of Table 3 Community Expected Population by 2020 is unclear.

Page 18 the name of the historic document produced by Florida Preservation Services is Lee County Historic Sites Survey

Page 19 and Page 24 With regards to how to protect historic structures and whether to establish a community based architectural standards review board, it is important to consider that Lee County has a historic preservation ordinance that can regulate both historic and non-historic buildings.

Lee County has an active historic preservation program and a very effective historic preservation ordinance. Being designated under the Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 22 of the LDC) would most effectively protect historic structures; changes to historic buildings are reviewed per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Also if an area were designated as a historic district then in addition to reviewing changes to historic buildings, the ordinance would allow for the review of changes to non-historic buildings through the adoption of design guidelines.

This ordinance has been in place for 10 years and has proven record protecting individual historic resources as well as large scale historic districts like Boca Grande and Matlacha. (In both of these districts, historic and non-historic buildings are subject to review.) This ordinance is modeled after the best preservation ordinances in the country and meets the state and federal requirements for Certified Local Governments.

This ordinance is implemented by the Lee County Planning staff and the Lee County Historic Preservation Board, a 7 member board whose members are appointed on the basis their of profession or area of expertise and not on the basis of where they live.

Objective 19.1 is hard to measure since what constitutes a visually attractive community is not identified or defined. The phrase “visually attractive” is too subjective to serve as an effective regulatory standard.

Policy 19.1.1 The phrase “...signage consistent with the Community Vision and architectural standards”...would be hard to implement as the vision statement provides little guidance as to what signage would be appropriate and there are no defined or identified architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: A flat prohibition against a deviation is usually too rigid to be applied fairly in the day to day permitting process.

Policy 19.1.3. It is unclear what is meant by “older projects” and what type of incentives these projects would need.

The Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 22 of the LDC) has provisions for zoning relief for designated historic structures that do not meet current zoning regulations. Also the designated historic structures are exempt from FEMA flood regulations and the Building Official has some discretionary latitude so that modern building codes are applied in manner that do not destroy the historic character of a designated resource.

Policy 19.1.4: This policy is similar to 19.6.6. The two could be made to dovetail each other better.

Policy 19.1.5 This policy should reference the Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance, which is already implemented, rather suggesting that a new concept: a Historic Development Overlay district be implemented.

Objective 19.2 is hard to measure since what constitutes “tasteful shopping and employment opportunities” and the “community character” is not defined. These phrases are too subjective to serve as effective regulatory standards.

Policy 19.2.1 Requiring all commercial development to be reviewed as a commercial planned development might not be practical.

Policy 19.2.3 This policy needs to be more definite. How will non-residential uses be encouraged to be mixed use in nature and allow for residential uses? What are minor commercial uses?

Policy 19.2.4. What specific regulations must be adopted or amended to encourage or “incentivize” mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road.

Policy 19.2.5 How will Lee County discourage retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway in favor of service and residential uses?

Objective 19.3 seems hard to measure, as the phrase “strictly evaluating” is not defined. (The word strictly is too subjective to be an effective regulatory standard.)

Policy 19.3.1. How will higher density residential developments with a mix of unit types be encouraged?

Policy 19.3.3. A good way to protect large lot residential areas is to prohibit the creation of small lots from these larger lots. Is this applicable to this area?

Objective 19.4 What county regulations, policies and discretionary actions must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats? How must they protect or enhance them?

Policy 19.4.2 Lee County takes a countywide approach to land acquisition. It is unrealistic to expect the county to focus its acquisition efforts on the area east of I-75 and along Estero Bay in the absence of a clearly demonstrated immediate need or threat.

Policy 19.4.4. merely states what Lee County is already doing.

Objective 19.5 This public participation objective is a bit unwieldy. Requiring that Lee County *encourage and solicit* public input and participation to and during the *review and adoption* of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, zoning approvals and *administrative actions* seems unrealistic. A more specific approach identifying the type of notice or participation requirement for each type of government action would be more implementable.

Policy 19.5.1 Development approvals are done by staff without public input.

Policy 19.5.3 What type of issue would trigger a public notice to persons within 500’?

Policy 19.5.3. What does a document clearinghouse mean?

Objective 19.6 It is unclear what level of service for community facilities would be necessary to support a “vibrant urban core”. What is a “vibrant urban core”/

Policy 19.6.3. If historic uses – rather than historic buildings – must be protected, then these uses must be identified.

Policy 19.6.6. This policy should dovetail policy 19.1.4.

S: \historic\estero\estero preliminary draft

RESPONSE TO ESTERO COMMUNITY PLAN: PRELIMINARY DRAFT
from: Quentin Quesnell, local historian; Roe/Straut professor in the humanities,
Smith College.

Considering the short time in which it had to be prepared, the draft is very good. However it is difficult to render a serious opinion on several important points because the supporting charts, tables, and maps are only named in this draft and not actually included. I will touch only some highlights of particular interest to me.

I.

Table 2 and table 3.

Table 2 "2020 population projections based on data and analysis" would seem to be the most important part of our planning. But it is not included. Instead we are given Table 3: "Community-expected population by 2020, which is nothing but the arbitrary guesses of 93 people. The answers are interesting for a sense of community feeling; but they have no scientific value and they are too wildly divergent to allow basing any plans on them.

But worse still, Table 3 concludes with an "average population answer" into which 27 non-responses have been averaged just as if they were 27 predictions that the population will be zero. But even if those 27 non-responses had been laid aside, an average of the remaining 93 responses would not be very useful. Suppose for instance that even one respondent had been a believing Koreshan who answered in terms of the published plans of Koresh in 1904: "Esteros will soon be a city of ten million." That one further response would have changed the average predicted population to 113,665.

I suggest that the table stand as is, but that "AVERAGE POPULATION ANSWER" be replaced by a short verbal analysis of the responses. For instance: "Of the 93 persons who did answer this question, 51 projected a population between 30,000 and 60,000. Only 19 thought the population would be less than 20,000 and only 16 picked a figure between 20,000 and 30,000."

II..The boundaries of the Estero Community.

The "recommended boundaries of the Estero Community"(p.4) illustrated in Exhibit 2 do not include Mound Key and the mouth of the Estero River. Estero cannot be understood without Mound Key and the mouth of the Estero River. They are the heart of its history from the 16th century on, as will be amply illustrated in the book I am preparing for the Estero Historical Society.

Page 4 claims that the recommended boundaries include essentially the Estero Fire District. But on my copy of the Estero Fire District map, Mound Key is a part of the Estero district. Only the postal zip code 33928 cuts it off from Estero. The issue for our community plan is not simply how many people live there today, but what role this piece of land can play in our own self-understanding. Even as a State of Florida archaeological preserve, Mound Key will need local protectors and advocates in the near future. The citizens of Estero are the natural candidates for those roles.

III.Planned Development Approvals.

The future land use map (FLUM) and Exhibit 3 (pp. 10ff.) are missing. They would be very helpful.

The explicit figures on p. 13 explaining the relation between living space and commercial development space are helpful. But the community probably wants to know not only what the projections are but what will actually be allowed. Is there a provision in law anywhere that says these projections may not be exceeded and that takes away the commissioners' power to approve development beyond those projections? Isn't that the kind of thing the community is concerned about?

The discussion on p. 13 of "another source of frustration" is too gentle. Does use of bubble MCP result only in "perceived uncertainty"? Even if most projects are "adequately articulated," the fact that there have also been "recent notable exceptions" means that community frustration has resulted from more than perceived uncertainty. It is frustration over engineered uncertainty, pressing the details of what the law allows in order to obscure and conceal what the community really has a right to know.

IV. Natural Resources.

The discussion on p. 13 is also too gentle. Whatever the perceptions, the community has articulated the common sense position that if we now need any water restrictions, we should not go on approving further demands for water until we are certain where the extra water is going to come from. The need for water restrictions is always a common sense red signal of danger. The proper thing to do is to stop and look around again before proceeding. All the plans mentioned on p. 14, "continuing to work with private developers," etc. are good, but planning, encouraging, and working with can also be nothing but promises, promises.

V. Historic Resources (p. 18ff.)

Very good suggestions. However, the fact that the "map depicting the historic area" is not in fact included makes the suggestions on p. 19 seem to be aimed at the area which is already a state park. In fact, it is "the surrounding Community of Estero" which has abundant resources subject to loss through careless development. The "historic area" map should include the area between East Broadway and Corkscrew, from Hwy 41 at least to Sandy Lane.

VI. Development approval process (p. 24)

This is very important; but has to be implemented in a way that is not too burdensome to developers and even homeowners. To multiply excessively the persons and organizations that must be explicitly notified is risky and may end up with the notification becoming practically meaningless (like

some of the official land and zoning notices in technical language posted in the newspapers just to fulfill legal requirements).

Might it not be more effective to choose now one or two organizations of large membership and recognized standing to maintain a watchdog committee. Official notice would be sent to this organization and it would be their responsibility to pursue anything that seemed to require further attention. They would then translate the issue into laypersons' language and alert their membership and other organizations that something of general interest was underway.

Perhaps this is the place to include in the plan mention of the existence of the gated communities. They are natural organizational units within Estero and they could be recognized and made use of as a way of reaching the citizenship on this and similar issues.

VII. SOME GENERAL REFLECTIONS.

As with the last point mentioned, the gated communities, there are several large issues that are a part of envisioning the future and could be called to people's attention in this planning process. For instance, what percentage of the population already lives in the gated communities? Do we want that to be the pattern of living for the next 30,000 people to move in here? To what extent do these already existing organized communities want to be separate? Or do they prefer to be unconcerned over any larger community called Estero? As islands within Estero, they probably rightly expect great independence in decisions about beautification, landscaping, building design. But even as islands, they could be units of "government" within Estero, the fastest and easiest way to ascertain and to cultivate community feeling on many issues.

The suggestions under point 3. Detailed Master Planning (p. 25f.) for developing focal points, not just for practicality but for making visible the existence of Estero by attention to the impressions of anyone driving through north and south or even east-west, are very good. The plan should be given wide enough distribution to get the community talking about these things, as also about the need to choose now sites for schools, playgrounds, parks, community centers, clinics, meeting places. On the other hand, once we choose them, how are they to be provided? Estero has no funds to buy lands and no authority of eminent domain. Perhaps the plan could say more clearly to whom suggestions can be made and how that person or office will be responsible for handling the suggestions, what account they will have to make eventually and to whom.

Should there not be express mention at some point of how all this is complicated by the fact that more than a third of our dwelling units are only seasonally occupied and more than a third of the population are

seasonal? For instance, surely the move to create this Community Plan, from the Ford-dealership story on down, would have been different if it had all happened between January and March rather than from July to September. Again, this fact ought to be a topic of extended discussion in the community, because it will always be a source of difficulties. What are the items that the year-round residents and the seasonal residents both want? That is where our real strength lies.

A vision for the future will be built around major features of Estero already in existence—a restored and living river, the bay, Mound Key, the waterfront park lands; the State Park, the high school, the university, the Teco arena; highway 41 and Corkscrew, not just for transportation but to convey to the world an image of a place that is self-aware and proud; the gated communities, the trailer parks, the churches, the historic district. An introduction-to-Estero map should be created for newcomers, one which features only such items. It would not attempt to list all the streets, but only to single out against a general geographical backdrop all that most makes Estero what it is. Publishing such a map in even the simplest, roughest form would be a great stimulus to community comment and discussion.

Quentin Quesnell
September 25, 2000

FAX COVER SHEET

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.
Attorneys at Law

MUhle@humphreyandknott.com

1625 HENDRY STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 2449
FORT MYERS, FL 33902-2449

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722
TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446

TIME: TOTAL PAGES INCLUDING COVER PAGE: 3

DATE: January 5, 2001

| | | |
|-----|----------------|----------|
| TO: | Charles Dauray | 495-0201 |
| | Greg Stuart | 337-2496 |
| | Alan Fields | 774-6420 |
| | Paul Schryver | 261-9125 |
| | Matt Noble | 479-8319 |
| | Paul O'Connor | 479-8319 |

FROM: Matt Uhle

COMMENTS: Re: Estero Community Plan

Jan 8th letter to Mitch Hutchcraft attached.

#: 6533.000

ATTORNEY'S INITIALS: MDU

ORIGINAL: Mailed- _____ Federal Expressed- _____ Held in File- XX

SHOULD YOU HAVE PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS TRANSMISSION, PLEASE CALL SENDER AT (941) 334-2722.

THIS FAX SENT FROM FAX # (941) 334-1446 ___ / (941) 334-2801 ___ / (941) 334-8458 XX/ by: zw

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: The information contained in this facsimile message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copy of this telecopy is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the united states postal service. Thank you.

G:\MDU\Koreschan\multi.fax4.wpd

HUMPHREY & KNOTT

JAMES T. HUMPHREY
GEORGE H. KNOTT*†
GEORGE L. CONSOER, JR.**
MARK A. EBELINI
GAREY F. BUTLER

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
1625 HENDRY STREET (33901)
P. O. BOX 2449
FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33902-2449

THOMAS B. HART
MARK A. HOROWITZ
H. ANDREW SWETT
MATTHEW D. UHLE
AARON A. HAAK

*Board Certified Civil Trial Lawyer
**Board Certified Real Estate Lawyer
†Board Certified Business Litigation Lawyer

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722
TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446
MUlde@humphreyandknot.com

DIRECTOR OF ZONING AND
LAND USE PLANNING
MICHAEL E. ROEDER, AICP

January 8, 2001

Mitch Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor LLP
12730 New Brittany Blvd., Suite 600
Ft. Myers, FL 33907

Re: Estero Community Plan

Dear Mitch:

As you know, our firm is representing the Koreshan Unity Foundation in its effort to rezone property under its control located between US 41, Sandy Lane, Corkscrew Road, and County Road. The rezoning application has already been filed under the current regulations and Lee Plan, and we have every reason to believe that the case will be heard long before the Community Plan will become effective. Nevertheless, we are concerned about policies in the proposed Plan which are inconsistent with our MCP and which, in some cases, appear to have been specifically intended to frustrate my client's intentions.

As I have stated previously, the Riverplace application is clearly consistent with the overall thrust of the draft Community Plan. However, the Plan still contains language which does not appear to have any basis in the development history of Estero, in the survey, or in any of the data and analysis. These items include:

1. We have never seen a map of the "historic area" which is to be the subject of the moratorium. We have provided data, however, which describes the location of the historic resources on the KUF property, all of which will be protected pursuant to our MCP. There is no reason to impose any additional regulations, let alone a moratorium, on the KUF property in light of the commitments made in the zoning application and the existence of adequate historic preservation regulations in the LDC.

Mitch Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor
January 8, 2001

2. The Plan still contains a general rule prohibiting "special case" findings, although you have proposed to add language in Policy 19.2.2 and under Goal 6 which appears to permit "special cases" in Estero upon somewhat different (and ill-defined) findings of fact. Since the County, to my knowledge, has never made a "special case" finding in Estero, it is difficult to see why this language is in the Plan. KUF has provided excellent reasons in its zoning application to move a small amount of the commercial intensity which would normally be found at a major intersection away from the historic resources and onto property which is less historically and environmentally sensitive. Under these circumstances, we believe the "special case" prohibition in the Plan should be removed.
3. Your proposed Policy 19.2.3 does not consider the fact that the US 41/Corkscrew Road intersection, which already contains a large shopping center, is not shown as a node on Map 19.

We hope you will consider these items in your deliberations. We look forward to discussing them at the various County hearings.

Sincerely,

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.



Matthew D. Uhle
MDU/zw

cc: Charles Dauray
Greg Stuart
Alan Fields
Paul Schryver
Matt Noble
Paul O'Connor

Marsa B. Detscher
1803 Ardmore Rd.
Fort Myers, FL 33901
941.334.3939



September 26, 2000

Gloria Sajgo, AICP, Principal Planner
Lee County Planning Division
P. O. Box 398
Fort Myers, FL 33902-0398

RE: Preliminary Draft of the Estero Community Plan

Dear Gloria:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Preliminary Draft of the Estero Community Plan. I preface my observations with a few comments. Firstly, I strongly endorse any community's efforts to articulate a community vision as a community-building and forward-thinking activity. I believe it is important that a community develops this vision through a widely participative process, ensuring the greatest opportunity for all to provide input and consideration. Secondly, I found it difficult to limit my comments to the narrow scope of historic preservation. Past experiences in planning, visioning, and community-building made it impossible for me to overlook the rest of the document. Finally, I appreciate the fact that this is a draft document, prepared within a limited time frame. However, there are many blank pages containing missing exhibits and tables which might explain some of my comments.


- The only reference to (the first) Table 3 appears on page 10. If the purpose of this table is to illustrate public perceptions of projected growth, this could be accomplished more succinctly. Since the data in Table 2 is missing, it is unclear whether or not this public perception data warrants a large portion of this report.
- It appears that a primary impetus of this report is the articulation and preservation of lifestyle issues important to the community. The report contains dwelling unit and population estimates, a summary of dwelling units approved for development, and will include population projections (blank Table 2). However, we know nothing of these people. More expansive demographic data (e.g. household sizes, ages, household income levels, etc.) will facilitate a clearer picture of projected impacts on quality of life issues, such as public facilities, environment, transportation, employment generation, and so on. This data would be important to ascertain whether or not the assertions that the current development pattern as depicted on the FLUM is indeed "appropriate for guiding the future growth of the community".
- There are two tables labeled Table 3 (pages 9 and 13).
- There are repeated references to community priorities as expressed by the community members. It would have been helpful to see these in Table # on page 22.
- Suggestions to develop a Historic Overlay may be unnecessary since the County has an Historic Preservation Ordinance. Existing preservation mechanisms may be adequate to

Letter to Gloria Sajgo
Page 2

- address the historic preservation objectives, rather than creating another land development regulation. In my experience, "overlays" are not well received in the development community.
- Item 6 on page 30: I do not have a copy of the Lee Plan; however, it would appear that these items are (or should be) considered at this time and should not need to be particular to Estero.
 - Phraseology used in several of the Objectives and Policies presented (pp. 32-36) include ill-defined concepts that can become sources of conflict. Examples include "visually attractive" (Objective 19.1), "tasteful" (Objective 19.2), "strictly evaluating" (Objective 19.3), and "necessary to support" (Objective 19.6). Use of absolutes may also become problematic, such as "may not approve any deviation" (Policy 19.1.2), "all commercial developments" (Policy 19.2.1), and "may not be permitted" (Policy 19.2.2). The "significant incentives" in Policy 19.4.1 may conflict with other policies that are absolutes (e.g. Policy 19.1.2).
 - Policy 19.2.1: I question the practicality of such requirement.
 - How does Objective 19.5 differ from current practice? Is there a local group or recognized organization willing to assume this responsibility?
 - Policy 19.1.5 and Policy 19.6.3: An Historic Preservation Ordinance exists. Historic District designation may be appropriate for the "historic area".
 - Phase II, Proposed Action 1. In developing roadway landscaping requirements, there must be a careful consideration of landscaping with respect to commercial building and signage visibility. Parallel efforts to create signage "consistent with the community vision" may conflict with other aesthetic efforts. Success of such a program must reflect a balance between roadway appearance and building visibility.
 - Proposed Action 5. It is unclear what is inadequate in the current submittal process.
 - Proposed Action 6. See comment above regarding Policy 19.2.1.
 - Phase III, Proposed Action 1. I commented earlier on the proposal for the creation of a Historic Development Overlay. Nonetheless, if historic preservation is important to the community, it should not be included in Phase III; appropriate measures need to be implemented as soon as practicable.
 - Page 38 is blank, and there is no page 39.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to review Estero's draft Plan. I hope my comments are helpful in the preparation and consideration of the Plan. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Marsa B. Detscher, AICP



Department of Environmental Protection

Jeb Bush
Governor

Koreshan State Historic Site
PO Box 7
Estero, FL 33928
(941)992-0311

David B. Struhs
Secretary

September 25, 2000

Mr. Mitchel A. Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

Dear Mr. Hutchcraft,

I have taken the time to review the Preliminary Draft of The Estero Community Plan and have the following comments:

The state park should be referred to as Koreshan State Historic Site throughout the document.

The Koreshan Unity Settlement is a National Historic District. The portion of the Koreshan Unity Settlement Historic District found in Koreshan State Historic Site is located within a 40 acre parcel adjacent to US Highway 41. The District extends to the east, across US Highway 41 on the grounds currently managed by the Koreshan Unity Foundation. The total acreage of the state park is 192.6 acres. Mound Key State Archaeological Site a 166.6 acre parcel found on the island of Mound Key is located at the mouth of the Estero River and is also managed by staff at Koreshan S.H.S. Accessible by boat, Mound Key is a highly significant resource that should be considered in this plan as well.

Twelve historic structures, seven landscape features, extensive artifact and archival collections are maintained by the park. The Koreshan Unity Settlement is not maintained by the state as a "religious shrine". The national register nomination form prepared by the Department of State, Division of Historic Resources in 1975 described the significance of the site as follows:

"The physical remains of the Koreshan community are preserved because they represent a unique philosophical and religious movement, because they illustrate a cooperative settlement of the past era and because they are remnants of a pioneer community which, in many ways, typified life on the south Florida frontier around the turn of the twentieth century. The extant gardens are of value to tropical horticulturalists."

Accurate representation of the site is crucial to the support and success of community planning efforts.

"Protect, Conserve and Manage Florida's Environment and Natural Resources"

Printed on recycled paper.

SEP 27 AM 9:03
LEE COUNTY
RECEIVED

Mitchel Hutchcraft
September 25, 2000
Page 2

Management guidelines for the park are described in Unit Management Plans for both parks. Unit plan development has directly involved input from community representation in a DEP Advisory Groups. The Advisory Group for the Koreshan State Historic Site Unit Management Plan met in March, 2000 to provide input in the development of the current plan.

Unit Plans provide a management program overview, a description of the resources as well as conceptual land use plans that guide activities associated with natural and cultural resource management and any facility development. Any needs, uses or facility development described in the community plan which directly involve the use of state lands associated with these parks should reflect the management direction described in the plan. If you would like to review a copy of the unit plan, please let me know.

Policy 19.1.5 and Policy 19.6.2 creation of a public plaza/interpretive area for vehicular access would be difficult with the congestion, noise and traffic levels that currently exist. Safety concerns at the junction of US Highway 41 and Corkscrew Road would present serious drawbacks. Pedestrian/bicycle access to the park from US Highway 41, along Corkscrew Road is currently non-existent and is desperately needed to provide resident access into the park. Any proposal to consider a change in the current park access must take into account traffic speed and flow, the size of vehicles that regularly enter the park as well as the number of vehicles that attend special events. Noise levels and traffic vibration emanating from US Highway 41 have raised concerns for the need for landscaping, fences and walls to protect the cultural resources as well as restore the tranquility of the park setting. The park is willing to work closely with the community with those goals in mind.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments during the process of developing this plan. Strong community support has served Koreshan State Historic Site well during my tenure as Park Manager. I look forward to creating a stronger relationship with the residents of Estero by continuing to work with them.

Sincerely


Jeanne M. Parks
Park Manager

Cc: Michael K. Murphy, Chief, Bureau of Parks, District 4
Gloria M. Sajgo, Principal Planner, Lee County
Bill Grace, President, Koreshan Unity Alliance
file

JAMES T. HUMPHREY
GEORGE H. KNOTT *†
GEORGE L. CONSOER, JR. **
MARK A. EBELINI
GAREY F. BUTLER

* Board Certified Civil Trial Lawyer
** Board Certified Real Estate Lawyer
† Board Certified Business Litigation Lawyer

HUMPHREY & KNOTT

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
1625 HENDRY STREET (33901)
P. O. BOX 2449
FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33902-2449

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722

TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446

MUhle@humphreyandknott.com

LEE COUNTY
SEP 25 2000
PLANNING & ZONING
COMMISSION

THOMAS B. HART
MARK A. HOROWITZ
MATTHEW D. UHLE
H. ANDREW SWETT

DIRECTOR OF ZONING AND
LAND USE PLANNING
MICHAEL E. ROEDER, AICP

September 22, 2000

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

RE: Estero Community Plan

Dear Mitch:

Our firm represents John Madden, Trustee, the owner of the parcel west of U.S. 41 that is commonly known as Estero Greens. The property is zoned CPD. The owner is currently seeking development order approval for an automobile dealership on a portion of the 24-acre site. As you are undoubtedly aware, the dealership was the source of considerable controversy, and the issue is in litigation.

The LDC currently provides that planned development zonings are vacated after five years unless the applicant applies for a development order for a "substantial portion" of the project within that time frame. Once the applicant has complied with that requirement, however, the zoning remains in place indefinitely so long as the developer adheres to the phasing schedule, if any, shown on the MCP. Your proposed Policy 19.2.7, however, directs the County to consider the possibility of adopting new regulations which would apparently have the effect of vacating all existing planned developments, even if they have already met all of the current vesting requirements, after five years. When read in connection with proposed Policy 19.2.6, this policy would result in the elimination of the automobile dealership use from the schedule of uses for Estero Greens, which would substantially diminish the value of the property.

There can be no doubt that the purpose of the proposed policy is to divest projects that the County currently considers to be vested. At best, it would only address projects which are merely in the development order process; at worst, it would destroy the effectiveness, not just of vested zonings, but of outstanding development orders as well. It will have a major impact, not just on Estero Greens, but on every planned development in the Estero area. The potential Bert Harris Act liability for the County could be enormous.

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

The County currently has the legal ability to require projects that have been vacated to comply with its most recent regulations. We believe that is as far as the County can, or should, go.

Sincerely,

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Matt Uhle".

Matthew D. Uhle

MDU/dr

cc: Rick Marchetta
Greg Stuart
Richard Collman, Esq.
Timothy Jones, Esq.
Paul O'Connor

PLANNING DIVISION



MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Noble, AICP, Principal Planner

From: Gloria M. Sajgo, AICP, Principal Planner 

Subject: Comments on the Preliminary Draft of the Estero Community Plan

Date: September 20, 2000

Page 9 the purpose of Table 3 Community Expected Population by 2020 is unclear.

Page 18 the name of the historic document produced by Florida Preservation Services is Lee County Historic Sites Survey

Page 19 and Page 24 With regards to how to protect historic structures and whether to establish a community based architectural standards review board, it is important to consider that Lee County has a historic preservation ordinance that can regulate both historic and non-historic buildings.

Lee County has an active historic preservation program and a very effective historic preservation ordinance. Being designated under the Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 22 of the LDC) would most effectively protect historic structures; changes to historic buildings are reviewed per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Also if an area were designated as a historic district then in addition to reviewing changes to historic buildings, the ordinance would allow for the review of changes to non-historic buildings through the adoption of design guidelines.

This ordinance has been in place for 10 years and has proven record protecting individual historic resources as well as large scale historic districts like Boca Grande and Matlacha. (In both of these districts, historic and non-historic buildings are subject to review.) This ordinance is modeled after the best preservation ordinances in the country and meets the state and federal requirements for Certified Local Governments.

This ordinance is implemented by the Lee County Planning staff and the Lee County Historic Preservation Board, a 7 member board whose members are appointed on the basis their of profession or area of expertise and not on the basis of where they live.

Objective 19.1 is hard to measure since what constitutes a visually attractive community is not identified or defined. The phrase “visually attractive” is too subjective to serve as an effective regulatory standard.

Policy 19.1.1 The phrase “...signage consistent with the Community Vision and architectural standards”...would be hard to implement as the vision statement provides little guidance as to what signage would be appropriate and there are no defined or identified architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: A flat prohibition against a deviation is usually too rigid to be applied fairly in the day to day permitting process.

Policy 19.1.3. It is unclear what is meant by “older projects” and what type of incentives these projects would need.

The Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 22 of the LDC) has provisions for zoning relief for designated historic structures that do not meet current zoning regulations. Also the designated historic structures are exempt from FEMA flood regulations and the Building Official has some discretionary latitude so that modern building codes are applied in manner that do not destroy the historic character of a designated resource.

Policy 19.1.4: This policy is similar to 19.6.6. The two could be made to dovetail each other better.

Policy 19.1.5 This policy should reference the Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance, which is already implemented, rather suggesting that a new concept: a Historic Development Overlay district be implemented.

Objective 19.2 is hard to measure since what constitutes “tasteful shopping and employment opportunities” and the “community character” is not defined. These phrases are too subjective to serve as effective regulatory standards.

Policy 19.2.1 Requiring all commercial development to be reviewed as a commercial planned development might not be practical.

Policy 19.2.3 This policy needs to be more definite. How will non-residential uses be encouraged to be mixed use in nature and allow for residential uses? What are minor commercial uses?

Policy 19.2.4. What specific regulations must be adopted or amended to encourage or “incentivize” mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road.

Policy 19.2.5 How will Lee County discourage retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway in favor of service and residential uses?

Objective 19.3 seems hard to measure, as the phrase “strictly evaluating” is not defined. (The word strictly is too subjective to be an effective regulatory standard.)

Policy 19.3.1. How will higher density residential developments with a mix of unit types be encouraged?

Policy 19.3.3. A good way to protect large lot residential areas is to prohibit the creation of small lots from these larger lots. Is this applicable to this area?

Objective 19.4 What county regulations, policies and discretionary actions must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats? How must they protect or enhance them?

Policy 19.4.2 Lee County takes a countywide approach to land acquisition. It is unrealistic to expect the county to focus its acquisition efforts on the area east of I-75 and along Estero Bay in the absence of a clearly demonstrated immediate need or threat.

Policy 19.4.4. merely states what Lee County is already doing.

Objective 19.5 This public participation objective is a bit unwieldy. Requiring that Lee County *encourage and solicit* public input and participation to and during the *review and adoption* of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, zoning approvals and *administrative actions* seems unrealistic. A more specific approach identifying the type of notice or participation requirement for each type of government action would be more implementable.

Policy 19.5.1 Development approvals are done by staff without public input.

Policy 19.5.3 What type of issue would trigger a public notice to persons within 500’?

Policy 19.5.3. What does a document clearinghouse mean?

Objective 19.6 It is unclear what level of service for community facilities would be necessary to support a “vibrant urban core”. What is a “vibrant urban core”/

Policy 19.6.3. If historic uses – rather than historic buildings – must be protected, then these uses must be identified.

Policy 19.6.6. This policy should dovetail policy 19.1.4.

S: \historic\estero\estero preliminary draft

1500 W. Monroe - Meeting - Oct. 30th 2000

| | Sign in sheet | Phone |
|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Eddie Peri | E. Pivic | 495-8090 |
| Weg Jovall | E. Chamber | 947-6363 |
| GLORIA SAJOO | Lee Co. Planning | 479-8311 |
| Rick Burris | Lee Co. Planning | 479-8526 |
| Brandy Ambrose | Lee Co. Planning | 479-8316 |
| Matt Noble |) | 479-8546 |
| NEAL NOETHLICH | ESTERO PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE | 495-6698 |
| DON ESLICK | " " " " | 949-4050 |
| MITCH HUTCHCRAFT | VANASSA DAVIES | 437-4601 |

AUGUST 08, 2000

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Lee County Commissioners was held this date with the following Commissioners present:

John E. Albion, Chairman

Douglas R. St. Cerny, Vice-Chairman

Ray Judah

John E. Manning

Andrew W. Coy

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. The Invocation was given by Dr. Dane M. Blankenship, Sr., First Baptist Church of Cape Coral, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

9:30 A.M. AGENDA ITEM - Public Comment on Agenda Items

Consent (CA) and Administrative (AA)

No one came forward to offer comment.

The following are the Consent Agenda items that each Board member wished to have discussed:

Commissioner Coy - none

Commissioner Manning - none

Commissioner St. Cerny - none

Commissioner Judah - none

Commissioner Albion - 4(a)

CONSENT AGENDA

1. COUNTY MANAGER

(a) ACTION REQUESTED:

Authorize Chairman to execute loan documents with SunTrust Bank for long term financing of University Overlay MSBU Project, and authorize Budget Amendment Resolutions to reflect this transaction.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Allow the implementation of Long Term Debt Financing for the University Overlay MSBU Project without pledging the Non-Ad Valorem Debt Capacity of the County.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Provides Private Placement Financing for the University Overlay MSBU Project. (#20000691-Budget Services)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.
RESOLUTION NOS. 00□08□09 thru 00□08□11

(b) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Present to the Board, for information and filing, the Object Code #504015 Expenditure Report for the third Quarter of FY00 (April through June 2000). The Expenditure Report is contained in the backup material to the Blue Sheet.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Lee County Ordinance #90-18.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Allows the Board to monitor expenditures being made by County Departments and Divisions to this object code. (#20000771-Administration)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

2. PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

No requests received.

3. COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

No requests received.

4. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Authorize the Chairman to enter into a contractual relationship with Signature Development Group, Inc. to utilize Option 2, the cash-contribution option, of the Bonus Density Program to achieve 23 bonus density units on a 9.7-acre site located at 16520 Pine Ridge Road in south Lee County.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Contract approval is required by Section 34-1519 of the Land Development Code (LDC) and by Administrative Code 13-12.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Approves the Board of County Commissioners entering into a Bonus Density Contract with the developer. This will then authorize the developer to construct 23 bonus units in accordance with the Housing Bonus Density subdivision of the LDC, Option 2, the cash-contribution option. (#20000670-Planning)

PULLED FOR DISCUSSION

Commissioner Albion informed the Board that he wished to abstain from this item. Commissioner Coy moved to approve, seconded by Commissioner Manning, called and carried with Commissioner Albion abstaining.

(b) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Accept Petition to Vacate #VAC1999-00021 to vacate county road rights-of-way, located on the north side of Bonita Beach Road approximately 2 and ½ miles east of Interstate 75, in unincorporated Lee County, Florida, and adopt a Resolution setting a Public Hearing for September 12, 2000, at 5:00 p.m.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To extinguish the public interest in the rights of way.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Sets the time and date of the Public Hearing. (S33-T47S-R26E) (#20000723-Development Services)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.
RESOLUTION NO. 00-08-12

5. HUMAN SERVICES

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve submission to HUD of Lee County's FY 2000-2002 Three-Year Consolidated Strategic Plan and HUD FY 2000 One-Year Action Plan; authorize Chairman to sign HUD Consolidated Plan Letter of Submission and Certification; authorize Chairman to sign HUD CDBG and HOME Entitlement agreements upon receipt from HUD; authorize Chairman to sign HUD CDBG and HOME Subrecipient Agreements once prepared; and authorize Chairman to sign Consolidated Plan consistence letter and environmental assessments.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

HUD requires entitlement communities to complete HUD Consolidated Plan in order to receive the entitlement funding for community planning, neighborhood revitalization, and capital projects program funds.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Allows Lee County to continue to receive HUD community planning improvements, affordable housing, and neighborhood program funds. (#20000769-Human Services)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

6. INDEPENDENT DIVISIONS

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Award Service Provider Agreement for CN-00-06, Employee Insurance Benefits Consultant and Actuarial Auditor, to Aon Consulting, for an annual contract amount of \$150,000.00. This contract is for a one (1) year period with the option for two (2) additional one (1) year renewals.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Pursuant to the Contract Manual for Professional Services, approved by the Board on April 21, 1993, the Board is required to approve all Professional Services Agreements.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

The consultant will provide employee insurance benefits and actuarial auditor consulting services for Human Resources. (#20000770-Human Resources)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

7. PUBLIC SERVICE DIVISIONS

No requests received.

8. SOLID WASTE-NATURAL RESOURCES

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve two Interlocal Agreements with the City of Cape Coral, one for solid waste disposal and one for the Solid Waste Disposal Facilities Assessment.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To establish responsibilities and conditions between the County and the City regarding the disposal of solid waste and the processing of recyclable materials (Disposal Agreement); and to establish a County-wide system for determining, billing and collecting the Solid Waste Facilities Assessment within the City (Assessment Agreement).

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Establishes that the County will perform disposal and recycling processing services for the next ten years (Disposal Agreement), and provides for the County's levying and collecting a 'Facilities Assessment' within the City as long as the County and all cities in the County have similar agreements (Assessment Agreement). (#20000776-Solid Waste)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

(b) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve two Interlocal Agreements with the Town of Ft. Myers Beach, one for solid waste disposal and one for the Solid Waste Disposal Facilities Assessment.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To establish responsibilities and conditions between the County and the Town regarding the collection and disposal of solid waste and the processing of recyclable materials (Disposal Agreement); and to establish a

County-wide system for determining, billing and collecting the Solid Waste Facilities Assessment within the Town (Assessment Agreement).

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Establishes that the County will perform collection and disposal services for the Town for the next ten years (Disposal Agreement), and provides for the County's levying and collecting a 'Facilities Assessment' within the Town as long as the County and all cities in the County have similar agreements (Assessment Agreement). (#20000777-Solid Waste)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

(c) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve two Interlocal Agreements with the City of Sanibel, one for solid waste disposal and one for the Solid Waste Disposal Facilities Assessment.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To establish responsibilities and conditions between the County and the City regarding the disposal of solid waste and the processing of recyclable materials (Disposal Agreement); and to establish a County-wide system for determining, billing and collecting the Solid Waste Facilities Assessment within the City (Assessment Agreement).

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Establishes that the County will perform disposal and recycling processing services for the next ten years (Disposal Agreement), and provides for the County's levying and collecting a 'Facilities Assessment' within the City as long as the County and all cities in the County have similar agreements (Assessment Agreement). (#20000778-Solid Waste)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

(d) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve two Interlocal Agreements with the City of Bonita Springs, one for solid waste disposal and one for the Solid Waste Disposal Facilities Assessment.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To establish responsibilities and conditions between the County and the City regarding the collection and disposal of solid waste and the processing of recyclable materials (Disposal Agreement); and to establish a County-wide system for determining, billing and collecting the Solid Waste Facilities Assessment within the City (Assessment Agreement).

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Establishes that the County will perform collection services for the City for the next five years and disposal services for the next ten years (Disposal Agreement); provides for the County's levying and collecting a 'Facilities Assessment' within the City as long as the County and all cities in the County have similar agreements (Assessment Agreement). (#20000779-Solid Waste)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

(e) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve an Interlocal Agreement with the City of Fort Myers, for the Solid Waste Disposal Facilities Assessment. The term of this agreement is for approximately one year and expires on September 30, 2001.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To establish a County-wide system for determining, billing and collecting the Solid Waste Facilities Assessment within the City.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Provides for the County's levying and collecting a 'Facilities Assessment' within the City as long as the County and all cities in the County have similar agreements. (#20000782-Solid Waste)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

9. TRANSPORTATION

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve award of project #EX000527, the Purchase of Modular Furniture for the Department of Transportation, from Office Furniture & Design, at the prices stated in the Florida State Contract #425-001-97-1. Total cost of the project is \$93,485.00; therefore a not-to-exceed amount of \$100,000.00 is being requested to cover any

additional charges due to changes.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Section 11.0.3.1 of the Lee County Purchasing and Payment Procedures Manual exempts "the purchase of equipment that has gone through the Administrative Code Procedures, such as State Contracts or Federal General Services Administration Schedules, providing the purchase, rental or lease amount does not exceed \$50,000.00". As this expenditure will exceed \$50,000.00, Board approval is required.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Allows the Department of Transportation to purchase the modular furniture required to relocate Depot 7 to Billy Creek. (#20000793-Transportation)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

10. UTILITIES

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve the extension of Contract #353 with Azurix North America Operating Services, for RFP 97 01, Wastewater Treatment Plant Operations, until the new Utilities Operating contract is in place.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

The Board approved the original Service Provider Agreement for a three (3) year period. Any extension requires Board approval.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Azurix North America Operating Services will continue to operate the High Point Wastewater Plant until the new contract to operate all Lee County Utilities Facilities is in place and the Jet Port Interstate Commerce Wastewater Plant until it goes off line (which is anticipated to be in October, 2000). (#20000762-Utilities)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

11. COUNTY ATTORNEY

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve three resolutions approving the issuance of Lee County Industrial Development Authority Bonds on behalf of Eagle Net USA, Inc., for acquisition, construction, and equipping of a picture framing manufacturing facility in an amount not to exceed \$5,500,000.00; on behalf of H.O.P.E. of Lee County, Inc. d/b/a Hope Hospice and Palliative Care, for acquisition, construction, and equipping of certain hospice facilities to be owned and operated by H.O.P.E. of Lee County, Inc. d/b/a Hope Hospice and Palliative Care, in an amount not to exceed \$10,000,000.00; and on behalf of PrivateSky (TM) Aviation Realty, LLC, for acquisition and construction of an aviation maintenance service center in an amount not to exceed \$8,000,000.00.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Authorizes Industrial Development Authority to issue industrial development bonds pursuant to Chapter 159, Florida Statutes.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Provides Board consideration of proposed Industrial Development Authority Bonds as required by Internal Revenue Code and Florida Statutes. Board approval will authorize and adopt three separate resolutions, one for each proposed Industrial Development Authority bond as set forth above. (#20000781-County Attorney)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.
RESOLUTION NOS. 00-08-13 thru 00-08-15

12. HEARING EXAMINER

No requests received.

13. PORT AUTHORITY

No requests received.

14. CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve disbursements.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Florida Statute Chapter 136.06(1) requires that all County disbursements be recorded in the Minutes of the Board.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Compliance with the requirements of FS 136.06(1). (Clerk of Courts)

Commissioner Manning moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.

15. COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

No requests received.

16. VISITOR AND CONVENTION BUREAU

No requests received.

17. PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

No requests received.

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**1. COUNTY MANAGER**

No requests received.

2. PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

No requests received.

3. COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

No requests received.

4. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

No requests received.

5. HUMAN SERVICES

No requests received.

6. INDEPENDENT DIVISIONS

No requests received.

7. PUBLIC SERVICE DIVISIONS

No requests received.

8. SOLID WASTE-NATURAL RESOURCES

No requests received.

9. TRANSPORTATION

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Authorize the Chairman to execute a Resolution authorizing the submittal of a \$6 million loan application from the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB), with a guarantee of repayment from surplus toll revenues, to fund the construction of the Veterans Memorial Parkway Extension (f/k/a Burnt Store Road Extension) from Surfside Boulevard to SR 78.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

The loan application is due to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) August 15, 2000, and must be accompanied by a repayment guarantee.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Authorizes pursuit of a funding source to complete the construction phase of the Veterans Memorial Parkway Extension in FY 2000/01, years in advance of when it would otherwise be done. (#20000739-Transportation)

Commissioner Manning moved the item, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.
RESOLUTION NO. 00-08-16

10. UTILITIES

No requests received.

11. COUNTY ATTORNEY

(a) **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Consider and approve an Interlocal Agreement for the reorganization of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

The Interlocal Agreement is required by Chapter 339.175, Florida Statutes, and federal law under which the MPO program operates.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Expands MPO membership to include the City of Bonita Springs and to increase the City of Cape Coral's membership to four (4) seats. (#20000717-County Attorney)

Commissioner Manning moved the item, seconded by Commissioner Coy, for discussion. Responding to Commissioner Coy's question, Assistant County Attorney Melody A. Bowers presented a handout (copy is on file in the Minutes Office) and stated that the MPO members will be able to take their office/seats at the beginning of the MPO meeting on Friday, August 11, 2000. Attorney Bowers referred to her memorandum dated August 4, 2000, entitled "Interlocal Agreement for Reorganization of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Tuesday, August 8, 2000"; noted there were three separate issues to be approved and requested the Board: (1) adopt a resolution authorizing the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners to execute the MPO interlocal agreement; (2) approve/execute the Interlocal Agreement reorganizing the Lee County MPO; and (3) approve/execute the Supplemental Interlocal Agreement to the Interlocal Agreement reorganizing the Lee County MPO, and added that No. 3 is necessary in order to provide for certain provisions that are applicable only to the Lee County MPO and did not need to be included in the original MPO with the State. The Chairman suggested removing the original motion; the motion was removed. Commissioner Manning moved the Resolution, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried. Commissioner Manning moved the Interlocal Agreement, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried. Commissioner Manning moved the Supplemental Interlocal Agreement, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried. RESOLUTION NO. 00-08-22

12. HEARING EXAMINER

No requests received.

13. PORT AUTHORITY

No requests received.

14. CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS

No requests received.

15. COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

No requests received.

16. VISITOR AND CONVENTION BUREAU

No requests received.

17. PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

No requests received.

COMMISSIONER ITEMS

GULF COAST UNIVERSITY CAMPUS HOUSING - Commissioner St. Cerny informed the Board that Assistant County Attorney Timothy Jones wished to discuss the subject of housing at the University. Attorney Jones requested the Board authorize two public hearings on August 22, 2000, and September 12, 2000, to amend the Campus Development Agreement to allow additional on-campus housing to be constructed between now and the end of 2001; clarified that the University did not plan to have the additional housing units but the demand is now far greater than expected; noted that the issue has been reviewed by the County staff and no additional impacts have been found; stated that there was insufficient time to bring this item before the Board via a Blue Sheet because the University has just advised him that they will have a bond issue on September 19, 2000; and requested Board authorization to schedule the advertisement and the Public Hearings. Commissioner St. Cerny moved, as requested by the County Attorney's Office, the dates of August 22nd and September 12th for public hearings, seconded by Commissioner Manning, called and carried.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING EFFORTS - Referring to the August 07, 2000, Management and Planning meeting discussion on this issue, Commissioner Judah moved to budget \$6,700.00 for Phase I of the Estero community sector plan; and noted the funds will come from the Reserves and Funds balance, seconded by Commissioner Manning. Commissioner Judah added that, included in the motion, is a commitment that would then provide a means for incorporating Phase I into the next Comprehensive Plan Amendment round which is scheduled for September 29, 2000. During discussion, Commissioner Judah stated that the \$6,700.00 would be part of the \$25,000.00, and emphasized the need to make certain that this is actually part of the seed money because past discussions had indicated the Board would not exceed \$25,000.00 per community, and anything over that would come from the community itself. Commissioner Coy added that the Board had agreed, in concept, to go to \$25,000.00 in matching funds, and that several other areas can be included. Commissioner Judah stated he believed that the first \$6,700.00 is similar to seed money given to other communities in the past; and concurred with Commissioner Albion that it should be a part of the motion that the \$6,700.00 would come under the \$25,000.00 sum, but still be considered as seed money. The motion was called and carried.

BLACK ISLAND AND LOVER'S KEY DISCUSSION - Commissioner Judah called attention to a Bonita Springs group called Parks for People; explained that this group is hoping for discussion with and assistance from the state on the utilization of Black Island and Lover's Key; the group has requested that this Board ask the state parks to hold a public hearing in Bonita Springs to receive public input from the citizens as to options and opportunities for Black Island and Lover's Key. Commissioner Albion suggested a cooperative effort between Fort Myers Beach, Bonita Springs and the County, to get the publicity out for the meeting, and suggested resolutions from each entity. Commissioner Judah requested that Administration fashion a County resolution and forward it as soon as possible regarding a meeting on the utilization of Lover's Key and Black Island. Commissioner Coy stated he will ask the Executive Director of TDC to look into the matter. Commissioner Judah moved to have a public meeting, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried.
RESOLUTION NO. 00□08□17

FIVE-YEAR SUMMARY OF COUNTY ACCOMPLISHMENTS - Commissioner Albion referred to a book entitled "Fiscal Years 1996-2000 Five-Year Summary of County Accomplishments" that had been discussed during the Management & Planning meeting of August 07, 2000, and inquired as to the intended purpose for the book. County Manager Donald D. Stilwell suggested it be made available to the public; agreed that it could be put on the Internet; suggested that a press release be written for the Chairman to sign; noted that the book contains useful/accurate information on what has been accomplished in the past years; and added that since a Board Member has suggested staff condense the book and be more hard hitting in specific areas, staff may write a revision. Commissioner Coy requested a dozen copies for his office. The Chairman stated he believed the book should be properly packaged so that the people can understand its strengths,

weaknesses, and vision.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Commissioner Coy moved to reappoint Cliff Herdman to the **ROADWAY LANDSCAPE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**, seconded by Commissioner St. Cerny, called and carried.

COUNTY MANAGER ITEMS

County Manager Donald D. Stilwell had nothing to offer.

COUNTY ATTORNEY ITEMS

County Attorney James G. Yaeger offered clarification on a discussion heard at the Management & Planning Meeting of August 07, 2000, regarding transportation funding 2000, by explaining that the law which is in effect at this time has several components: county projects, small county projects, and a transportation component between seaports, international airports and markets. The Chairman stated that an item in today's agenda referred to the westerly extension of Veterans Parkway and State Infrastructure Bank, and noted that it comes under this law.

The Chairman recessed the meeting until 5:00 p.m. The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 5:00 p.m. with all Commissioners present with the exception of Commissioner Manning, who was participating in the Growth Management Study Commission meeting in Orlando.

5:00 P.M. AGENDA ITEM - Public Hearing

(#1) ACTION REQUESTED:

Adopt a Resolution on Petition to Vacate #VAC2000-00005 to vacate a 30-foot wide Public Utility and Drainage easement running east and north-west on or adjacent to the following lots: Parcel 1, Lot 16, and Parcel 2 lying in the west one-half of government Lot 5, River Grove Estates, Lee County, Florida.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To combine adjacent lots into one building site. The vacation of the drainage easement will not alter existing drainage and the easement is not necessary to accommodate any future drainage requirement.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Vacates the easement. There are no objections to this Petition to Vacate. (S36-T43S-R25E) (District #5) (#20000790-Development Services)

Assistant County Attorney John J. Fredyma approved as to legal form and sufficiency, the Affidavits of Publication for 5:00 p.m. Agenda Items (1), (2), and (3). Attorney Fredyma described this vacation for the Board. Commissioner Judah moved the item, seconded by Commissioner St. Cerny. Responding to Commissioner Albion's questions, Attorney Fredyma stated that there is a satisfactory Perpetual Stormwater and Drainage Easement replacement in effect. The Chairman called for public input; however, no one came forward. The motion was called and carried with Commissioner Manning absent. RESOLUTION NO. 00□08□18

5:00 P.M. AGENDA ITEM -Public Hearing

(#2) ACTION REQUESTED:

Adopt a Resolution on Petition to Vacate #VAC2000-00026 to vacate a twelve foot wide Public Utility Easement less & except the easterly and westerly six feet thereof, Lehigh Acres, Florida.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To combine adjacent lots into one residential building site.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Vacates the easement. There are no objections to this Petition to Vacate. (S35-T44S-R27E) (District #5) (#20000721-Development Services)

Assistant County Attorney John J. Fredyma approved as to legal form and sufficiency, the Affidavits of Publication for 5:00 p.m. Agenda Items (1), (2) and (3). Attorney Fredyma described this vacation for the Board. Commissioner Judah moved the item, seconded by Commissioner Coy. The Chairman called for public input; however, no one came forward. The motion was called and carried with Commissioner Manning absent. RESOLUTION NO. 00□08□19

5:00 P.M. AGENDA ITEM - Public Hearing

(#3) ACTION REQUESTED:

Adopt a Resolution on Petition to Vacate #99-09-185.01R to vacate a twelve-foot (12') wide Drainage and Public Utility Easements centered on the side lot lines common to Lots 17 and 18 and Lots 18 and 19, Block 80, Unit 10, Lehigh Acres as recorded in Plat Book 15 at Page 72, LESS and EXCEPT the north and south six feet (6') thereof.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

To provide for the subdivision of Lot 18 with the east one-half to be combined with Lot 17 and the west one-half to Lot 19. The vacation would provide for future single-family residential construction on the recombined lots. The vacation of the drainage easements will not alter existing drainage and the easement are not necessary to accommodate any future drainage requirement. The Public Utility Easements are not necessary to accommodate any future utility requirement.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Vacates the easement. There are no objections to this Petition to Vacate. (S25-T44S-R26E) (District #5) (#20000745-Development Services)

Assistant County Attorney John J. Fredyma approved as to legal form and sufficiency, the Affidavits of Publication for 5:00 p.m. Agenda Items (1), (2), and (3). Attorney Fredyma described this vacation for the Board. Commissioner Judah moved the item, seconded by Commissioner Coy. The Chairman called for public input; however, no one came forward. The motion was called and carried with Commissioner Manning absent. RESOLUTION NO. 00-08□20

5:00 P.M. AGENDA ITEM - Public Hearing

(#4) ACTION REQUESTED:

Adopt a Resolution regarding the transfer of Time Warner, Inc.'s, Cable Television Franchise to America Online, Inc./Time Warner, Inc.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Lee County Ordinance No. 89-05 and F.C.C. Form 394 set forth the procedure for transferring the control of cable television franchises.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Formalizes the process for the County to deny or permit the transfer of control of the cable television franchise. (#20000446-Public Resources)

Assistant County Attorney Andrea R. Fraser approved as to legal form and sufficiency, the Affidavit of Publication and described this item for the Board. The Chairman called for public input; however, no one came forward. Commissioner Judah moved the item, seconded by Commissioner Coy, called and carried with Commissioner Manning absent. RESOLUTION NO. 00-08-21

5:00 P.M. AGENDA ITEM - Public Hearing

(#5) ACTION REQUESTED:

Adopt an ordinance that adopts a Lee Plan small scale amendment, PAM 99-26.

WHY ACTION IS NECESSARY:

Administrative Code 13-6 and Florida Statute 163 require that small scale amendments be adopted by a majority of the entire Board of County Commissioners.

WHAT THE ACTION ACCOMPLISHES:

Changes the Lee Plan Future Land Use Map Series, Map 1, from Rural to Outlying Suburban for a specified less than ten acre portion of a parcel of land located near Burnt Store Marina in Section 06, Township 43 South, Range 23 East, generally located east of Matecumbe Key Road and west of Charlee Road. (#20000671-Planning)

Assistant County Attorney Timothy Jones approved as to legal form and sufficiency, the Affidavit of Publication regarding this item. Commissioner Judah moved for adoption, seconded by Commissioner Coy. The Chairman called for public input and no one came forward; however, Attorney Beverly Grady, of the law firm of Roetzel Andress, responded that she was present. The motion was called and carried with Commissioner Manning absent. The Ordinance adopted by the Board and filed was LEE COUNTY ORDINANCE NO. 00-16 ENTITLED:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LEE COUNTY

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE "LEE PLAN" AS ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 89-02, AS AMENDED, SO AS TO AMEND THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP SERIES, MAP 1, THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP, FOR THAT SMALL SCALE DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT KNOWN AS PAM 99-26, WCI COMMUNITIES, WHICH IS LOCATED IN SECTION 06, TOWNSHIP 43 SOUTH, RANGE 23 EAST, TO REDESIGNATE APPROXIMATELY TEN ACRES OF LAND FROM RURAL TO OUTLYING SUBURBAN, AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

5:05 P.M. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS OF MATTERS BY CITIZENS

COMMISSIONER JUDAH LEFT THE MEETING AT THIS TIME.

Linda Marie Meredith, representing the Everest Homeowners Association of Cape Coral - requested the exit to Del Prado off of Everest Parkway not be closed, and explained that the homeowners who live in this area would like to work with staff for a more equitable solution. Commissioner Coy suggested the staff look into this situation to see if it can be "tweaked".

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 5:12 p.m.

ATTEST:
CHARLIE GREEN, CLERK

Deputy Clerk

Chairman, Lee County Commission

AUGUST 07, 2000

A Workshop Meeting of the Board of Lee County Commissioners sitting as the Board Management and Planning Committee was held this date with the following Commissioners present:

John E. Albion, Chairman

Douglas R. St. Cerny, Vice-Chairman

Ray Judah

John E. Manning

Andrew W. Coy (arrived at 1:36 p.m.)

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Referring to the Agenda Revision Recap Sheet dated August 07, 2000, the Chairman announced that:

Item #8 is to be pulled.

One Walk-On Item is scheduled to be heard.

1. STATUS OF BONITA SPRINGS TRANSITION**Status Report for the transition of County services and revenues to the newly incorporated City of Bonita Springs****OPTIONS FOR BASIS OF LOCAL OPTION GAS TAX (LOGT) DISTRIBUTION**

1. LOGT revenues only
2. All transportation expenditures
3. Population
4. Population for Fort Myers Beach & Bonita Springs only
5. Centerline miles
6. 50/50 split between centerline miles and population

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends using the Gas Tax formula based on a 50/50 split between centerline miles and population for newly incorporated areas of Lee County and for existing Interlocal Agreements as they lapse.

Reviewing the report contained in the backup material, Assistant County Manager Bruce Loucks noted that services and operational support for activities in Bonita Springs are being reviewed by both the City and the County; that agreements have been approved for Hearing Examiner, Solid Waste, and Animal Control services; and that draft agreements are being developed or reviewed for Natural Resources, Transportation, Community Development, and Parks and Recreation. In reference to Non-Operational Issues, Mr. Loucks stated that there

is an agreement with City staff and the Vice-Mayor, to be taken to the City Council for approval, that electrical franchise fees collected during the period from January 1 through April 15, 2000, will remain at the County to be used for the jail expansion. After briefly describing the status of impact fee agreements, Mr. Loucks explained the basis for the staff recommendation concerning the Gas Tax formula and the ultimate goal of a methodology to be used with all existing and newly incorporated areas. He pointed out that the County's portion has been used to fund municipalities created after the original Interlocal Agreements. COMMISSIONER COY ENTERED THE MEETING AT THIS TIME. Commissioner Judah expressed concern that the recommended formula would cause conflict between the municipalities, noted that other municipalities are reluctant to modify their contracts, and suggested a five-year agreement with Bonita Springs using the Fort Myers Beach formula. General discussion ensued, during which Mr. Loucks, County Manager Donald D. Stilwell, and Division of Transportation Director Scott M. Gilbertson responded to the Commissioners' questions concerning: the effects of increased allocations to the municipalities on the County road program, the benefit of Bonita Springs projects to the entire County, the deletion or delay of the Summerlin Road project, the reallocation of revenue to various CIP projects, and the results of the private consultant study prepared for Bonita Springs. Commissioner Judah suggested a two-year agreement using the Fort Myers Beach formula. Commissioner Albion proposed use of a base amount, with funding for agreed projects above that amount, for a three-to-five year period; pointed out that all areas should work together to improve the road system; and commented on the conflict that could occur if allocations to newly incorporated areas eliminate or delay projects that are important to existing municipalities. The direction to staff was to look at the recommended formula, include a provision for two years of additional funding for the Bonita Beach Road resurfacing, and present the results to the Bonita Springs City Council. Commissioner Judah agreed to work with Mr. Loucks on the presentation, and Commissioner Coy expressed his preference for the two-year time frame. In reply to Commissioner Manning's question, Commissioner Judah reported that an application is being submitted for a \$6-million grant, from the Mobility 2000 Program, for the extension to Burnt Store.

2. IMPOSITION OF COSTS OF PROSECUTION FOR CODE ENFORCEMENT VIOLATIONS

Provide direction as to the imposition of the costs of prosecution for code enforcement cases (violations).

OPTIONS:

A. Impose costs of prosecution when a violation, which has not been abated within the time allowed by Codes, is brought to public hearing; and a finding of violation is made by the Hearing Examiner based on the evidence and testimony of both sides.

B. Impose costs of prosecution when a violation, which was abated before the scheduled public hearing, is presented to the Hearing Examiner for a finding of violation.

RECOMMENDATION:

Hearing Examiner recommends Option A.

Code Enforcement Staff recommends Option B.

Chief Hearing Examiner Diana M. Parker explained that a difference of understanding exists between her office and Code Enforcement staff as to the Board's goals regarding the imposition of costs, and requested that the Board provide more specific direction. In response to Commissioner Judah's inquiries, Ms. Parker stated that the applicable statute allows Code Enforcement to recover costs in cases where a violation has occurred, whether or not the violation has been abated prior to a scheduled hearing; noted her reluctance to charge a minimum of \$285.00 for a first-time "mom-and-pop" offender; added that she had no problem with imposing the fines on repeat offenders; and summarized the understanding of Code Enforcement staff that the costs should be assessed for all violations. After Commissioner Manning suggested a change in the fee structure, Assistant County Attorney Timothy Jones described situations that result in extra costs to the County, noted that staff would not normally ask for costs in a "mom-and-pop" case, and opined that Code Enforcement staff should determine whether a cost award should be requested and the Hearing Examiner should be directed to grant any such request. Ms. Parker pointed out the inequity of assessing costs to "nasty" first-time offenders and waiving

costs for the "nice" ones. During the discussion that followed, Ms. Parker and Attorney Jones answered questions from the Board and provided additional information concerning: the notices given and the time allowed for abatement of violations, the need to prevent repeat offenses, the costs incurred for investigation and prosecution, and the effects of violations on surrounding neighborhoods. Commissioner Albion asserted that sufficient notice is given and time allowed for the violation to be abated well before any public hearing; and that, unless there are extenuating circumstances, costs should be assessed to anyone who does not abate the violation within the time frame provided. After Commissioner Judah recommended Board consensus on Option B, Commissioner Coy suggested that the time clock for costs not begin until after the second notice. COMMISSIONER MANNING LEFT THE MEETING BRIEFLY AND RETURNED DURING THE DISCUSSION. Commissioner Albion confirmed that the Board consensus was Option B, with limited flexibility for the Hearing Examiner based on equities and on reasonable extenuating circumstances.

3. SANIBEL CAUSEWAY PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL (PD&E) STUDY

To report on the current status of the PD&E Study, with particular emphasis on the rehabilitation, low-level bascule, mid-level bascule, and fixed bridge alternatives; as well as the water circulation study undertaken for the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD).

RECOMMENDATION:

Proceed with the study.

Division of Transportation Director Scott M. Gilbertson briefly reviewed the preliminary report presented to the Board in May, noted that findings are now available from the water quality study performed by the University of Florida for SFWMD, and summarized the topics of today's presentation. Mr. Gilbertson then introduced PBS&J Project Manager Sharon Phillips, who utilized a slide presentation to report on: a workshop meeting held in June, which was attended by about 175 people; the public comments that indicate a preference to keep the islands, utilize the rehabilitation option, eliminate sidewalks, and reduce the proposed bridge width; and the environmental impacts of new construction on seagrasses and wetlands. Ms. Phillips reviewed the conclusions of the water quality study: that minor circulation motions caused by the islands did not appear to significantly affect residual flow and salinity patterns, that the islands did not seem to block the entry of ocean water, and that additional comprehensive monitoring and ecological data is needed. She noted that the first conclusion of the PD&E study was that the tunnel option was not viable, and the second conclusion is that the islands would not be removed. PBS&J Project Director Jim Kennedy briefly reviewed the previously presented maintenance and rehabilitation alternatives, including the advantages, disadvantages, and estimated service life associated with each option. COMMISSIONER ST. CERNY LEFT THE MEETING BRIEFLY AND RETURNED DURING MR. KENNEDY'S OPENING REMARKS. After itemizing the existing structural problems, Mr. Kennedy described features of new construction alternatives for Structure A: a low-level bascule at a minimum of 26 feet above mean high water level (MHW); a mid-level bascule of up to 50 feet above MHW; and a fixed bridge at a minimum of 70 feet above MHW. He added that new Structures B and C would be similar to the current bridges, except for the addition of piers, longer spans, and greater width and height. Mr. Kennedy explained calculations used to project the actual costs, over the life of the bridge, for each of three alternatives - maintain/build, rehabilitate/build, and build now; pointed out that a new bridge will eventually be needed; and asserted that, although "build now" would be the cheapest in terms of actual dollars spent, the best long-term investment for the County would be the maintain/build option. He summarized the conclusions reached so far by the PD&E study: eliminate the tunnel, leave the islands, and reduce the width of the typical section; and itemized conclusions yet to be drawn, which will be discussed at meetings on August 10 and August 29, 2000 - island hardening, revised typical section, Bridge A structural integrity, and increased navigational clearances. After Commissioner Coy pointed out that the County has been promoting sidewalks for all transportation systems, Commissioner Judah suggested requesting an opinion from the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Council; and Commissioner Albion recommended soliciting input at the workshop on August 10, as well as from the Sanibel City Council. Ms. Phillips responded that the main concerns about sidewalks were deterioration and safety hazards due to fishing from the sidewalks. Commissioner Albion remarked that the proposed bike path portion could be built in such a way that part of it could be converted to sidewalk at a later date.

AT THIS TIME, ITEMS #5, #6, AND #7 WERE HEARD. SEE THAT PORTION OF THE MEETING.

4. FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING EFFORTS

Discuss whether the County should actively support local efforts to conduct sector or community plans by directing more involvement from the Division of Planning and providing limited financial incentives.

OPTIONS:

1. Provide matching funds not to exceed \$25,000.00.
2. Provide a fixed amount of funding.
3. Authorize additional staff in the Division of Planning to conduct these planning studies in-house.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Board of County Commissioners commit matching funds, not to exceed \$25,000.00, for each individual community planning study. Staff further recommends that the Division of Planning be authorized to assist in these community planning studies with existing staff.

INITIAL DISCUSSION ON THIS ITEM OCCURRED IN CONJUNCTION WITH WALK-ON ITEM #1. SEE THAT PORTION OF THE MEETING.

Planning Director Paul S. O'Connor reported that several communities are involved in efforts to design modifications to the Comprehensive Plan that are specific to their areas, and requested direction from the Board as to the degree and kinds of support the County should offer. Commissioner Judah indicated that Option 1 would be acceptable with staff's involvement to the extent that personnel are available; and expressed appreciation for the efforts of the various communities. In reply to Commissioner Coy's inquiry, Mr. O'Connor stated that, although the availability of funding may encourage planning efforts in some areas that would not otherwise have considered it, there is no guarantee that every square foot of unincorporated Lee County will be involved. Mr. O'Connor responded to additional questions from Commissioners Albion and Judah by stating that a typical planning study should cost between \$20,000.00 and \$60,000.00, that Administrative Code criteria for funding eligibility could be developed within 1 to 1-1/2 months, and that the Estero Phase I planning study will be included in the list of County-initiated Comprehensive Plan amendments. Commissioner Albion commented on the need for County supervision, and Commissioner Judah suggested that the \$6,700.00 deficit in the Estero Phase I study could be funded from reserves if Option 1 is accepted. There was Board consensus to accept staff's recommendation of Option 1 and to bring up funding of the Estero study as a Commissioner Item at the Regular meeting on August 8, 2000.

IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION OF ITEM #3:

5. UTILITIES OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACT MONITORING PLAN

Present an independent evaluation addressing the current monitoring of the operations and maintenance contracts for Lee County Utilities, and provide recommendations for improvements or changes.

OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Malcolm Pirnie, Consulting Engineers, have been asked to complete an evaluation of the Operations and Maintenance Contracts, the current level of contract monitoring, and any necessary recommended improvements. This report will be reviewed by Internal Audit and by Cape Coral City Manager Steve Daignault; and final recommendations will be presented today.

County Manager Donald D. Stilwell reported that Malcolm-Pirnie had submitted their report last week, that it has been referred to the Clerk's Audit Staff and to Mr. Daignault's Engineering Staff, and that meetings should take place later this week to discuss the results and formulate recommendations. Mr. Stilwell indicated that this item was included to keep the Board informed about the status of this issue.

6. PALMETTO AVENUE EXTENSION

Determine if the County should fund the Palmetto Extension as requested by the City of Fort Myers; and, if so, which Capital Improvement Projects(CIP) to delay to make funding available.

OPTIONS:

Note: All options include allocation of \$275,000.00 in District 1 impact fees to the Palmetto Extension in FY 01.

1. Summerlin Road Boy Scout - University

Delete the construction phase for the Summerlin Road six-laning and overpass from the Edison Community College (ECC) entrance to Boy Scout Road.
(\$12,534,000.00 District 4 impact fees and gas taxes in FY 05)

Delay right-of-way acquisition for the Summerlin Road Project two years to FY 04.
(\$3,973,000.00 in District 4 impact fees in FY 02)

Allocate \$1,881,000.00 in District 4 impact fees in FY 01 for design and right-of-way for the Palmetto Extension.

Allocate \$1,501,000.00 in District 4 impact fees and \$2,900,000.00 in gas taxes in FY 02 for construction for the Palmetto Extension.

2. Three Oaks Parkway Widening

Delete the construction phase for the Three Oaks Parkway four-laning from Corkscrew Road to Alico Road.
(\$8,010,000.00 in District 4 impact fees in FY 03)

Delay the design phase for the Three Oaks Project two years to FY 04.
(\$990,000.00 in District 4 impact fees)

Delay the right-of-way acquisition phase for the Summerlin Road Project one year to FY 03, with no other changes to this Project.
(\$3,973,000.00 in District 4 impact fees in FY 02)

Allocate \$1,881,000.00 in District 4 impact fees in FY 01 for design and right-of-way for the Palmetto Extension

Allocate \$4,401,000.00 in District 4 impact fees in FY 02 for construction for the Palmetto Extension.

3. Three Oaks Parkway Extension North

Delete the construction phase for the Three Oaks Parkway four-lane extension from north Alico Road to Daniels Parkway. (\$8,600,000.00 in District 4 impact fees and gas tax bond proceeds in FY 01)

Allocate \$1,881,000.00 in gas tax bond proceeds in FY 01 for design and right-of-way for the Palmetto Extension.

Allocate \$1,419,000.00 in gas tax bond proceeds and \$2,982,000.00 in District 4 impact fees in FY 02 for construction for the Palmetto Extension.

RECOMMENDATION:

If it is the Board's intent to fund the Palmetto Extension as requested by the City of Fort Myers, staff recommends that the Board pursue Option 1; however, the project costs should be split equally. The delay of the Summerlin Road project would be more tolerable, in regard to level of service (LOS) and system continuity issues, than delays of the Three Oaks projects. If enough funding can be obtained from other sources (grants and special assessments) then perhaps the delay to the Summerlin project can be minimized. Additionally, staff recommends that a new method of distributing the local option gas tax to the City of Fort Myers should be a consideration in the Interlocal Agreement.

Division of Transportation Director Scott M. Gilbertson stated that grant opportunities are available only if a dedicated funding source can be shown for matching funds, and that other projects would have to be sacrificed to provide that funding source; reviewed the listed options; recommended that the cost share be on a 50/50 basis, because the proposed front-foot basis would be more appropriate for a project funded by assessments; and reported that new funding incentives are becoming available through the state that could change the funding scenario for the next CIP and allow reinstatement of a deferred project. Commissioner Judah commented on the current LOS problems at the Summerlin/College intersection and on the importance of the Three Oaks project as a reliever for US 41 and I-75, and asked whether any other projects could be considered. Mr. Gilbertson responded that all current projects are driven by LOS problems and current traffic needs; and that, while the Palmetto Extension is in the long-range plans, it is not currently an LOS issue. In response to Commissioner Albion's inquiry, Mr. Gilbertson stated that the Three Oaks four-laning is a continuity issue, since the roadways north and south of this segment will be four-laned within five years. He added that information on incentives program funding should be available by the end of the year, and that other revenues might then be available for Palmetto Avenue next year. Commissioner St. Cerny remarked that the County needs to partner with the City and School District in complying with the desegregation order, that a course of action should be identified to begin the initial phases, and that inquiries should continue into sources of additional financing. Mr. Gilbertson noted that unallocated District 1 impact fees, in the amount of \$275,000.00, could be applied to the design work; and that other funding issues could be resolved while design work is underway. In reply to Commissioner Manning's questions, Mr. Gilbertson stated that Palmetto Avenue is included in the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) 2010 plan, for completion sometime between 2006 and 2010; that the desegregation order was not considered in the MPO scheduling; and that there are other means of access to the new Dunbar High School. There was Board consensus to allocate the \$275,000.00 for

design work on the Palmetto Extension, and to direct staff to investigate all possible sources of additional funds. City of Fort Myers Planning Director Christine Hurley pointed out that project design would cost approximately \$719,000.00 and would require 10-11 months, that the City has allocated amounts based on the front-foot cost split, and that a phased-in project would be workable once an agreement is reached on the percentage split. Commissioner Manning commented on the MPO process of designating and funding projects to alleviate specific congestion problems; and on his reluctance to eliminate or delay the projects listed in the options, which have significantly wider value than the Palmetto Extension. The Board reached a consensus that \$275,000.00 in unallocated District 1 impact fees be applied toward design costs, that property owners be encouraged to assist, that a percentage split be determined for construction costs, and that the projects listed in the options be completed in the time frame of the current CIP.

7. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BLASTING ORDINANCE

Provide direction regarding amendments to the Lee County Blasting Ordinance to address current problems. Under the current ordinance, the blaster is the party responsible for measuring vibration levels resulting from blasting activity. It is being proposed that the County or its agents perform the vibration measurement function with the full cost charged to the blasting permit applicant. This will resolve the issues pertaining to delays in getting data to deal with complaints from neighbors about blasting vibration levels.

OPTIONS:

1. Do not amend the current Ordinance.

Delays in getting vibration results may allow for continued complaints from neighbors.

2. Amend the current Ordinance.

Eliminates self policing and provides for direct County involvement in the monitoring process, but produces additional workload for the County.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Option 2. Amending the Ordinance would provide for the County to perform vibration monitoring, including the use of contract services. The change will allow for more direct oversight of blasting activities and provide better information for dealing with complaints from citizens.

Commissioner Coy recommended approval of Option 2, and there was Board consensus to accept that recommendation. Development Services Deputy Director Bob Stewart requested permission to bypass committee reviews with the exception of the Local Planning Agency (LPA). Commissioner Albion observed that this seems to be an internal matter that would not require the committee review process.

8. ESTERO ISLAND BEACH RESTORATION PROJECT FUNDING

Address local cost share for the above referenced project, based on results of economic apportionment study.

OPTIONS:

1. North and South segments without ad valorem taxes
2. North and South segments with ad valorem taxes
3. North Segment only (TDC)

4. North Segment only (TDC, Town)
5. North Segment only (TDC, Town, and ad valorem)
6. North Segment only (TDC, Town, and ad valorem), without federal funds

RECOMMENDATION:

Proceed with North Segment of Project and fund local cost share from the Beach Renourishment Trust Fund and the Town of Fort Myers Beach.

DURING THE ANNOUNCEMENTS PORTION OF THE MEETING, THE CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCED THAT:

Item #8 is to be pulled.

In response to Commissioner Albion's inquiry, Natural Resources Environmental Sciences Deputy Director Roland Ottolini stated that the item was pulled because Visitor and Convention Bureau Director Elaine McLaughlin could not attend today's meeting; and that it will be rescheduled for a regular Board Meeting that Ms. McLaughlin can attend.

AFTER A BRIEF RECESS, THE CHAIRMAN CALLED THE MEETING BACK TO ORDER WITH ALL COMMISSIONERS PRESENT. AT THIS TIME WALK-ON ITEM #1 WAS HEARD. SEE THAT PORTION OF THE MEETING.

9. STATE OF THE COUNTY ADDRESS

This item will highlight the past and present successes of Lee County Government and address our upcoming challenges.

Referring to the report entitled "Fiscal Years 1996-2000 Five-Year Summary of County Accomplishments", Deputy County Manager William Hammond reviewed the accomplishments of the following Departments: Human Services, Public Safety, Transit, and Parks and Recreation. COMMISSIONERS JUDAH AND MANNING LEFT THE MEETING BRIEFLY AND RETURNED DURING MR. HAMMOND'S PRESENTATION. In response to Commissioner Albion's inquiry, Mr. Hammond reported that the County's cost per rider on Transit buses ranges up to \$22.00 depending on the nature of the route; and stated that a full presentation will be made at a Public Hearing on August 22, 2000. Assistant County Manager Bruce Loucks reviewed the accomplishments of the following Departments and Divisions: Community Development, Planning, Municipal Services Taxing/Benefit Units, Purchasing, Information Technology Group, Animal Services, Public Resources, Libraries, Human Resources, and Equal Opportunity. County Manager Donald D. Stilwell reviewed the accomplishments of the following Departments and Divisions: Community Development, Solid Waste, Visitor and Convention Bureau, Natural Resources, Economic Development, Fleet Management, County Lands, Facilities Management, and Transportation. Mr. Stilwell stated that this report is intended to publicize the many positive aspects of County operations to counteract the recent negative publicity; that the taxpayers are receiving more for their tax dollars than they were five years ago; and that the County has been doing more for less with innovative cost-efficient methods. He then itemized some of the County's major achievements: road construction and improvements, additional recreational and library facilities, efforts to insure a vibrant economy, protection of natural resources, reduction of the general tax rate to 40-cents lower than in 1990, reduction in the number of County employees, decrease in the County government percentage of the general fund budget, and annual expenditure increases of only 1.6% while County population has grown by 2.7% annually. He added that everyone should read this document to become aware of the many good things going on in Lee County, noted other areas where money has been saved, and emphasized the need to provide excellent customer service. Mr. Stilwell concluded his presentation by stating that perhaps the greatest challenge for the future is to maintain the confidence of the taxpayers that the County is providing the services needed to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the population in the most cost effective and efficient way. Commissioner Albion pointed out that the last 5 pages of the report contain challenges identified by County Management, the Board, and the Departments. After Commissioner Judah expressed hope that this impressive list of accomplishments will get out to the community, Mr. Stilwell opined that Commissioners Judah and Albion should be proud to use this as

a record to run on. Commissioner Albion commented that this could be a starting effort toward a public relations program, that it will allow taxpayers to learn about many County activities that don't directly affect them, that employees need to know that their efforts are appreciated, and that the report should be made available at no charge to the public.

AT THIS TIME, BOARD COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION TOOK PLACE. SEE THAT PORTION OF THE MEETING.

WALK-ON ITEM #1

HURRICANE SHELTER STATUS

Discuss hurricane shelter deficit funding.

OPTIONS:

1. From General Fund Reserves, allocate \$4.1 million for FY 00-01, \$2.3 million for FY 01-02, and \$200,000.00 for each of the fiscal years 02-03, 03-04, and 04-05.
2. From General Fund Reserves, allocate \$4.1 million for FY 00-01. Allocate the remaining amounts as listed in the above scenario from the County-wide Capital Improvements Fund.

RECOMMENDATION:

Consider noted options.

Public Safety Director John Wilson described the two options as provided in the memorandum from Principal Operations Analyst Sue Gilpin, that is included in the backup material; noted that either option will cover both the current deficit and new shelter needs that will be generated by FY 04-05; and pointed out that the costs to maintain and improve existing facilities is not included because those figures are not currently available. Mr. Wilson stated that Option 2 would require a millage increase for the Capital Improvement Fund from .5124 mill to .5396 mill for one year starting with FY 01-02, that the increase would be less than the resulting .0344 mill decrease in the All Hazards millage, and that only shelter maintenance would be funded from the All Hazards millage. Commissioner Albion observed that the \$4.1 million would not require a tax increase because it represents the difference between the amount set aside in Reserves and the amount actually given to the Sheriff by the Governor and Cabinet; and that an inequity exists because all of the 27,000 available shelter spaces have been paid for by the unincorporated areas of the County. He added that approximately 37.38% of the public live in the municipalities, excluding Bonita Springs and Fort Myers Beach prior to their incorporation; and that not all the municipalities have responded regarding their willingness to assist in shelter funding. He recommended to the Board that, since the \$4.1 million was generated County wide, it would be appropriate to use those funds for health and safety purposes; and suggested that funding from the General Fund or CIP monies must be accomplished in a way that reduces the subsidies that were taken out of the unincorporated taxing unit. Referring to Agenda Item #4, Financial Support for Community Planning Efforts, Commissioner Albion opined that the money which would have been spent on hurricane shelters from unincorporated MSTU, from \$300,000.00 to \$500,000.00 per year, could be used to resolve the problem of sector planning. After noting that only 50% of new developments are paying 50% of the cost to provide hurricane shelters to fill the needs they generate, Commissioner Albion opined that the Board should take steps to insure that all future shelter spaces are paid for with County-wide funds with 100% contributions from 100% of new development, and that both the shelter deficit issue and the sector planning issue can be resolved using available dollars with no tax increase. Commissioner Judah questioned the assumption for Option 1 about the number of EMS units; expressed concerns about the LeeTran, transportation disadvantaged, and 800 MHz system issues; requested a report on what portion of the \$4.1 million could actually be spent in the next year; and agreed that funds for community planning could be taken from reserves. Commissioner Albion asserted that the reserve funds should not be used for recurring expenses, and that \$300,000.00 should be more than adequate to fund the sector planning program. Ms. Gilpin concurred that the budget could handle that relatively small amount, pointed out that the EMS assumption was only one of several possibilities, noted that there is no information yet on the costs to bring existing shelters "up to speed", suggested that Mr. Wilson may wish to explain the

proposal to fund those improvements from the All Hazards fund, and added that CIP funds might be used instead. Commissioner Albion commented that it would be inequitable for 62% of the population to pay for 100% of shelter improvements. In reply to Commissioner Coy's inquiry, Ms. Gilpin confirmed that \$4,111,000.00 remains in the Taxpayer Relief Fund after the Sheriff's budget appeal. Commissioner St. Cerny reminded the Board of the commitment made at last year's budget hearings that funds not used for current year law enforcement would be returned to the taxpayers, and suggested clarification of that issue prior to any commitment of that money to any other purpose. County Manager Donald D. Stilwell remarked that the Board was not being asked for any immediate commitment, that budget recommendations would be prepared based on the Board's direction, and that this issue should be considered in context with other funding needs. After Mr. Wilson explained his plan to fund shelter maintenance from the All Hazards fund, Commissioner Albion emphasized the need to pay this expense from County-wide funds; and directed staff to develop an alternate plan based on results of the study when it becomes available.

AT THIS TIME, ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION OCCURRED REGARDING ITEM #4 ONLY. SEE THAT PORTION OF THE MEETING.

IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION OF ITEM #9:

BOARD COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONTRACT - Commissioner Manning inquired whether the contract extension for County Manager Donald D. Stilwell was scheduled for a full Board meeting. Among the subjects covered during the extensive Board discussion which ensued were: the absence of two Commissioners from the meeting on July 18, the issues that need to be addressed before the issue is considered again, the amended contract language that was presented on July 18, and the 90-day waiting period specified in the motion on that date. Commissioner Manning suggested that, since he and Commissioner Coy were on County business and unable to be present on July 18, the matter should be scheduled for reconsideration at the meeting closest to 30 days from that date, August 22, 2000. Commissioner St. Cerny recommended that the Board wait until after Labor Day to allow time for resolution of some of the issues. Commissioner Coy inquired whether Mr. Stilwell felt the issues would be sufficiently under control before Labor Day, and stated that either the 90-day window or after Labor Day would be acceptable. In response to Commissioner Albion's questions, Commissioner Judah explained that the reason for the 90-day waiting period was the projected availability of the ST audit results and that there are other outstanding issues. Commissioner Manning asserted that the utilities operations award and Mr. Stilwell's contract are two separate issues, that the contract language dealing with severance needs to be corrected, that Mr. Stilwell has acted decisively with respect to the utilities operation, and that the Board has received the requested report on accomplishments. After Commissioner Manning expressed disappointment at the action taken in his absence, Commissioner St. Cerny reviewed the reasons for that action. Mr. Stilwell stated that the current situation is demeaning both for him and for the Board, and that it creates an illusion of turmoil and conflict. Commissioner Judah confirmed that he would stand by his decision in favor of the 90-day window, and Commissioners Coy and St. Cerny concurred. Commissioner Albion pointed out that, in fairness to all concerned, each Commissioner who has any issues should bring them forward, preferably in writing, within that period.

TRUCK TRAFFIC ON CORKSCREW ROAD - Commissioner Judah noted that Estero residents on Corkscrew Road are concerned about the mining truck traffic, and suggested that staff be directed to prepare a position paper on possible Board action to limit or prohibit such traffic. After Commissioner Albion indicated that the Corkscrew Road Service Area (CRSA) Committee has been working on the situation, Board consensus was given regarding preparation of a position paper.

800 MHz SYSTEM USER FEES - Commissioner Judah reported that, once the warranty period is over in FY 02-03, the user fees for the 800 MHz system will increase from \$300,000.00 per year to almost \$1-million; requested a position paper on an equitable method for sharing this cost; and suggested that revenue from vendors that co-locate on the tower might be used to offset some of the cost. Commissioner Albion inquired as to what would cause such a large increase and requested that the position paper include a review of the initial agreement.

FIRE DISTRICT CONSOLIDATION STUDY - Commissioner Judah pointed out that the study presented by DMG has never been formally accepted or rejected by the Board, and that official action should be taken at the first opportunity.

FORT MYERS BEACH CRA ISSUE - Commissioner Albion mentioned that the differences between the County and the Town of Fort Myers Beach regarding CRA funds should be resolved as soon as possible.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

ATTEST:
CHARLIE GREEN, CLERK

Deputy Clerk Chairman, Lee County Commission

Estero looking to the future

8-12-80 pg 1A+
Meeting to focus 9A
on 'sector plan' of
growth guidelines

Bonita Barnes

By **CHAD GILLIS**
Staff Writer

Estero residents will have a chance to help shape local growth and voice their opinions next week on how the community should be developed in the face of mounting development pressures that have caused strained relations between the community and Lee County government.

The meeting is scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, Aug. 15, at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway. It's a joint effort between the Estero Civic Association and the Estero Chamber of Commerce, along with a private planner hired by the community.

The intent of the meeting is to compile a list of concerns and gather opinions about how to best manage future growth. The community plans to eventually add a "sector plan" to the county's land development code that would give Estero its own unique development guidelines and requirements.

EVER
See **ESTERO**, Page **9A**

Naples Daily
8-16-2000
Page 1B+2B

ESTERO

Residents clash on key growth issues

The community development meeting was the first of two scheduled by private planner Mitch Hutchcraft.

By CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

More than 100 Estero residents gathered Tuesday night to offer their input on how the community can control and plan for growth in the face of mounting development pressures.

The meeting, at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway, was the first of two scheduled by private planner Mitch Hutchcraft. Hutchcraft

was hired by the Estero Civic Association and Estero Chamber of Commerce to help residents draft a community development plan that could be implemented by Lee County commissioners within the next year.

Hutchcraft outlined key issues, such as identifying the community's boundaries and where commercial and residential development should be located, to a crowd with varied and often clashing opinions.

He also said Estero residents could hold public workshops before hearing examiner meetings to offer input to developers wanting to build in the area.

In the past, rezoning cases have disturbed many residents to the point they began considering annexing into Bonita Springs or incorporating.

The latest momentum for the community has been to form a community plan.

Hutchcraft estimated the community plan project would take between 18 and

24 months to complete.

Several residents were thrilled about the idea of forming a unique development plan for a community that is expected to go from about 9,000 residents to 40,000 or more within the next decade.

"This is probably the most exciting thing that's happened since the Korshans came to town," said Estero resi-

See GROWTH, Page 3B

Growth

Continued from 1D

dent Cas Obie. He added that he thinks residents should work with developers to identify areas targeted for high and low density.

Other residents, feeling Hutchcraft was siding with the development community, pleaded with the planner to come up with more effective means of dealing with county government.

"I think they're tired of being subjected to 4½ blind men,"

said Norm Lukes, referring to the half as Lee County Commissioner Ray Judah, who is often the lone dissenting voice during controversial rezoning cases. "... When do the citizens really get to input?"

Lukes said Estero is a community with its own mind and that it needs no direction from government officials in Fort Myers.

Still other residents disagreed on where to put commercial developments.

Those who live along Three Oaks Parkway said Corkscrew Road should be a commercial corridor, while residents on Corkscrew said high-density development should go on Three Oaks.

Some residents said a moratorium is the only way to effectively slow growth enough to get a handle on the community.

Hutchcraft responded to many of the disagreements by saying residents, as well as local developers, need to work together if a community plan is going to get the thumbs-up from Lee County commissioners.

Next on Hutchcraft's agenda is to submit a draft of the community plan to the Local Planning Agency near the end of the month. After that a second public meeting will be held for further input in mid-September before the plan is submitted to the county on or before Sept. 29.

RESIDENTS TO meet tonight on Estero development proposal

The plan will be an attempt to marry the desires of residents with those in the business community.

Naples Daily 8-15-77
By CHARLIE WHITEHEAD
Staff Writer *pg 1A+ 3D*

The future begins tonight for the community of Estero.

With an eye toward seizing control of the community's future, residents will gather at South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway to begin fashioning a communitywide development plan. The plan will be an attempt to marry the desires of residents with those in the business community, allowing for the future growth of the community while protecting the residents' vision.

That is vital if the plan is to go further than the planning stage, according to Lee County Planning Director Paul O'Connor. If the community expects Lee County commissioners to approve sweeping changes in the growth management plan, the community plan will have to be one supported by more than just one group of residents or businesses.

"If the planning effort is to be successful, it has to be very broad-based," O'Connor said. "It will have to be somewhat embraced by the entire community."

O'Connor said he has encouraged the various groups that have jointly launched the effort to make a concerted effort to include every portion of the community, from the most ambitious developer to the most strident preservationist. Otherwise, he said, commissioners aren't likely to make changes that dramatically affect the area's future.

See ESTERO, Page 3D

Estero

Continued from 1D

Eileen Galvin, executive director of the Estero Chamber of Commerce, said tonight's meeting is likely to help residents of the community better understand the way the plan will be developed.

"Most of the people are not knowledgeable about how the county works, but it's up to the residents of Estero to put their input into it," Galvin said.

The community has hired local professional planner Mitch Hutchcraft to draft proposed growth plan changes specific to Estero. The county has also stepped up with funding. Commissioners agreed last week to provide as much as \$25,000 in matching funds for so-called sector plans.

O'Connor, however, prefers "community plans."

"I want to call them community plans," he said. "People want a better sense of community. People don't live in a sector. They live in a community."

In Estero, the planning effort will take place in two phases. To amend the growth plan this year, changes must be proposed by the end of September. O'Connor said the community should address the issues it considers most pressing, with an eye toward presenting another round of changes next year.

"Ideally, when you do a community plan, it would take eight to 14 months. The community felt that waiting a year was not going to work," he said.

Galvin said she was pleased Estero residents would help decide how the community will evolve in the future. "The best way is to let all the people have a voice in it," she said.

Tonight's meeting is set for 6:30.

A little fear can sometimes go a long way

Fear sometimes gets a bad rap.

Nobody wants to be called a scaredy-cat, we're never supposed to let anyone see fear make us sweat, and there's the residual effect of that old adage about fear from John F. Kennedy.

A little fear can sometimes be a good thing, though, as Estero residents have been finding out lately.

Estero was the beneficiary earlier this week of a wise move by the Lee County Commission to give residents unprecedented influence over how their community is developed. The county agreed to let the residents come up with a "sector plan," a 50-cent term for a simple concept:

treating a certain area differently than everything else around it.

The county not only agreed to let Estero residents participate in such a plan, commissioners agreed to help fund it, voting unanimously to cough up \$6,700. You read that right: County commissioners voted to spend money to pay for something that might put a crimp in the current "There's no such thing as bad development" philosophy.

Why? Good old fear, that's why.

Estero residents have been loudly unhappy in recent months with the county's planning process, or lack of a planning process. They rallied to stop a proposed auto dealership on U.S. 41, they packed commission chambers to

protest "bubble plans" that give developers virtual carte blanche to build whatever they want. They wrote letters, they created activist groups, they made lots of noise about the possibility of incorporation.

In short, they scared county commissioners.

There is little scarier to the county, already reeling from the incorporation of Bonita Springs, than the possibility of losing another hunk of tax base, especially one that just so happens to be the fastest growing area in Southwest Florida.

This week's unanimous vote to fund the sector planning process was the direct result of that fear. Such

planning isn't restricted to Estero, but Estero will be the first to embrace it.

The initial meeting to gather input for the plan is at 6:30 p.m. this Tuesday, Aug. 15, at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway. That's not an awful lot of notice, but Estero doesn't have much time to play with: the community needs to have at least the first phase of such a plan done by Sept. 29.

The logistics of enacting such a plan are tortuous, but the goal isn't. At its simplest, a sector plan is designed to define a certain area and come up with development regulations tailored specifically to that area. Residents and planners would take a look at the entire community, see where the best

places would be for commercial development, for houses and condos, for parks and green space.

Such a process is a good idea for many reasons, not the least of which is that it recognizes that Estero isn't the same thing as Cape Coral or Lehigh Acres or North Fort Myers. A sector plan also could be an important step toward a new philosophy in growth management in which growth actually is planned for rather than reacted to.

If Estero does it right, maybe the rest of the county will realize you can take a big-picture approach to growth and manage it rather than letting it manage you.

That's not such a scary thought.

TODD PRATT

Estero residents get glimpse of community plan

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

ESTERO — Estero residents finally got a glimpse of the layer of protection they hope will stop developments they feel do not belong in their community.

More than 150 residents came to hear what their community plan will entail Tuesday night at the Corkscrew Woodlands Clubhouse.

A community plan is a way for residents to determine what their community will look like in the future. In Estero residents have been upset with recent development approvals such as a proposed Sam Galloway car dealership and the county's use of "bubble plans" that allow a wide variety of commercial uses.

Mitch Hutchcraft, the consultant hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to craft the community's vision, said the plan's preliminary draft incorporated the responses of more than 150 questionnaires handed out to Estero residents.

Hutchcraft said the first task in developing the plan was writing a vision statement for Estero. The statement calls for embracing Estero's historic heritage, carefully planning for future growth as a village and establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment.

Hutchcraft said once Estero's vision statement was developed, key community issues became the focus of the plan. They were:

- Community character — proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage and the location and type of certain

land uses.

- Residential land uses — maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment.

- Commercial land uses — limit tourist-oriented uses, detrimental uses such as adult entertainment, free-standing bars and liquor stores, and limit high intensity uses along specific corridors.

- Natural resources — protect groundwater resources and wetlands.

- Public participation — become more involved in the development approval process.

Hutchcraft also said beginning today, a draft of the plan will be available for all Estero residents to read through at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway.

Most residents attending the meeting were pleased with what they heard.

"I don't think we need a city status to achieve the goals everyone is talking about," said resident Jan Schneider.

Resident Doyle Moeller, 55, said he thinks the community plan will allow residents to keep Estero the way it is.

"It's a nice, clean community and I'd like to see it stay that way," Moeller said. "That the reason I moved here."

The recommendations and plan will be submitted to the county Sept. 29 for inclusion in the Lee Plan's amendment cycle.

— Contact Mark S. Krzos at mkrzos@news-press.com or 992-1345.

Residents' concerns outlined in draft of community plan

By CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

The rapid-fire path to a community plan for Estero climaxed Tuesday night with the unveiling of a draft plan before more than 100 people who turned out for a final meeting to offer their input.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a private planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead a community plan, presented his draft, which he must submit to Lee County officials by Sept. 29 if

it is to be voted on by county commissioners next year.

The meeting was the second of the summer conducted by Hutchcraft. An initial community plan meeting held in August drew 125 people.

Hutchcraft outlined the main concerns residents expressed at the previous meeting and through questionnaires distributed in August.

The top issue was protecting

See ESTERO, Page 14A

Estero

Continued from 1A

groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

Hutchcraft said of the more than 120 questionnaires that were returned in time for the draft, residents who wanted to see at least some commercial development said they'd prefer small shops over strip malls.

The general consensus of the community also, according to the returned questionnaires, centered around prohibiting commercial uses such as car lots and bars.

Overall, Hutchcraft said, Estero residents want to be able to influence a community many think has had little successful guidance in the past.

"There seems to be an impression that the community has just leap-frogged with no planned direction," Hutchcraft said.

An objective highlighted in Hutchcraft's presentation was increased public participation in county government.

He included a handful of policies in the first phase of the community plan aimed at integrating residents with the development approval process. The policy included mandating that the county notify groups within Estero of pending ordinance reviews, development code amendments or development approvals.

It also suggests the county establish a document clearinghouse in Estero where copies of planning staff and hearing examiner reports would be available for public inspection.

Prior to the meeting, participants received a summary of Hutchcraft's initial community plan draft that highlighted several sections in the plan, including preserving the historical facets of the community and protecting existing residential areas from intense commercial uses. His outline included defining the Estero community as a goal within the Lee Plan, which is a comprehensive blueprint for the entire county.

After Hutchcraft's presentation, several residents asked him how the community could best preserve resources such as the area's future drinking water supply.

Ellen Peterson, a local environmentalist, gave a bleak fore-

cast for the community's main water bodies.

"I think you're sort of being a little over optimistic to think you're going to protect the Estero River," Peterson said.

Peterson said the community should be concerned about water retention, adding that communities near the river send their overflow down the river and into the bay.

"The wells are going dry and they're going dry because the water doesn't get a chance to percolate down," she said.

Arnold Rosenthal told Hutchcraft during the meeting that he'd like to see more emphasis placed on parking lot setbacks and requirements. He said he was satisfied with Hutchcraft's work to this point.

"It's a good first draft given the time that he had," Rosenthal said. "I think we're on the right track."

If the Sept. 29 deadline is met, the county could hold Local Planning Agency hearings before Christmas. Such a timeline would bring any comprehensive plan considerations in front of county commissioners sometime in January.

After that, the plan would be reviewed by the state before a final vote by commissioners in spring 2001.

Residents offered 2nd look at plan for Estero

By CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

Estero residents will get one last shot to give their input on how to best plan for the community's future during a 6:30 p.m. meeting at Corkscrew Woodlands on Tuesday, Sept. 19.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a private planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead Estero's community plan, said he will present a draft of the first submittal of the community plan. The plan must be given to the county by Sept. 29 if county commissioners are to vote on adopting the development code language next spring.

Tuesday's meeting is the second of two involving Hutchcraft. The first took place at the South Lee County Regional Library last month with about 125 residents attending. The meeting was moved to Corkscrew Woodlands to accommodate more attendees. The community's clubhouse has a capacity of 300.

"We'll probably have some handouts of an executive summary of the actual Lee plan presentation," Hutchcraft said. "We'll also identify recommendations for the phase two and phase three of the plan."

Hutchcraft said he met Thursday with the Estero Community Plan Committee, which consists of six community representatives, including chamber and civic association members and developers, to discuss his current draft and any changes that need to be made to the summary before Tuesday's meeting.

After the meeting, Hutchcraft will have until Sept. 29 to submit the plan to the county if it is to be considered during the next fiscal year. Estero residents are trying to make changes to the county's development code so that there are development regulations specific to the fast-growing Estero area.

He said he's continually more optimistic about the first phase of the community plan, adding that several main issues, such as guiding development with an overall aesthetic blueprint, have surfaced from the residents who have given input so far.

Naples Daily News

9-16-00

Pg 1A & 11A

ESTERO

Continued from 1A

"I think everybody will be pleased (with the draft and the eventual community plan submittal)," he said. "It seems like there's a core consensus on a lot of issues."

Hutchcraft said he will post copies of the 40-page draft in the

library for residents to review after the meeting.

Chamber director Eileen Galvin said Estero residents who plan to attend the Tuesday meeting should come ready to share their ideas on how the community can best manage growth.

"They need to come with their thoughts if they haven't already

put them out there," Galvin said. "And hopefully they'll be constructive."

Galvin said forming a consensus of community concerns is the main objective of the information gathering meetings.

"You have to hope that you're getting a sample of the feelings of the majority of people," Galvin said.

Bonita Banner 9.23.00 pg 3c

Estero residents coming together on changes to development code

By CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

The rapid-fire path to a community plan for Estero climaxed Tuesday night with the unveiling of a draft plan before more than 100 people who turned out for a final meeting to offer their input.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a private planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead a community plan, presented his draft, which he must submit to Lee County officials by Sept. 29 if it is to be voted on by county commissioners next year.

The meeting was the second of the summer conducted by Hutchcraft. An initial community plan meeting held in August drew 125 people.

Hutchcraft outlined the main concerns residents expressed at the previous meeting and through questionnaires distributed in August.

The top issue was protecting groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

Hutchcraft said of the more than 120 questionnaires that were returned in time for the draft, residents who wanted to see at least some commercial development said they'd prefer small shops over strip malls.

The general consensus of the community also, according to the returned questionnaires, centered around prohibiting commercial uses such as car lots and bars.

Overall, Hutchcraft said, Estero residents want to be able to influence a community many think has had little successful guidance in the past.

"There seems to be an impression that the community has just leap-frogged with no planned direction," Hutchcraft said.

An objective highlighted in Hutchcraft's presentation was increased public participation in county government.

He included a handful of policies in the first phase of the community plan aimed at integrating residents with the development approval process. The policy included mandating that the county notify groups within Estero of pending ordinance reviews, development code amendments or development approvals.

It also suggests the county establish a document clearing-

The top issue was protecting groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

house in Estero where copies of planning staff and hearing examiner reports would be available for public inspection.

Prior to the meeting, participants received a summary of Hutchcraft's initial community plan draft that highlighted several sections in the plan, including preserving the historical facets of the community and protecting existing residential areas from intense commercial uses. His outline included defining the Estero community as a goal within the Lee Plan, which is a comprehensive blueprint

for the entire county.

After Hutchcraft's presentation, several residents asked him how the community could best preserve resources such as the area's future drinking water supply.

Ellen Peterson, a local environmentalist, gave a bleak forecast for the community's main water bodies.

"I think you're sort of being a little over optimistic to think you're going to protect the Estero River," Peterson said.

Peterson said the community should be concerned about wa-

ter retention, adding that communities near the river send their overflow down the river and into the bay.

"The wells are going dry and they're going dry because the water doesn't get a chance to percolate down," she said.

Arnold Rosenthal told Hutchcraft during the meeting that he'd like to see more emphasis placed on parking lot setbacks and requirements. He said he was satisfied with Hutchcraft's work to this point.

"It's a good first draft given the time that he had," Rosenthal said. "I think we're on the right track."

If the Sept. 29 deadline is met, the county could hold Local Planning Agency hearings before Christmas. Such a timeline would bring any comprehensive plan considerations in front of county commissioners sometime in January.

After that, the plan would be reviewed by the state before a final vote by commissioners in spring 2001.

Site sections... [Front page](#) | [Classified](#) | [GoShopNaples](#) naplesternews.com

Bonita | Bonita Daily News

   [Bonita front](#) | [Bonita archive](#) | [help](#)

Rapid growth has Estero looking like a large city, county officials say

Tuesday, October 17, 2000

By CHAD GILLIS, Staff Writer

There's enough planned and approved development in Estero to build a city with a population nearing the size of Fort Myers, two Lee County officials said Monday.

Development Services Director Mary Gibbs and Commissioner John Albion said development figures point to continuing, rapid growth in Estero. Gibbs and Albion spoke to about 100 people at the Estero Civic Association's first meeting of the season.

Gibbs said 8 million more square feet of commercial space and around 64,000 more residents are projected to move into the area in the near future. The current population of Estero is about 10,000 people.

"We need to do some planning," Gibbs said

Gibbs said that last year at this time she was informing the group about preliminary meetings county planners had with builders of the future 450-room Hyatt Coconut Pointe hotel just north of Bonita Springs. Now, she said, the five-star resort should be open within the next year.

Gibbs talked about the mall race in south Lee County among three developers - the Rouse Co., Simon Property Group and Jacobs Group. She also talked about Koresban Unity Foundation's newly submitted hotel/dormitory development for


SHOP
 Shop
 eat, a
 eat, a



artan
 Bu
 Wa
 SA



Acco
 Rep
 Buye
 Clic
 10
 th

RESTORATION CITY FOUNDATION'S NEWLY SUBMITTED HOTEL/COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOR U.S. 41 and Corkscrew Road called Riverplace of Estero, and the possibility of Miromar Lakes approaching the county for more residential units on its approved community north of Florida Gulf Coast University.

Many factors, such as the incorporation of Bonita Springs, have contributed to the recent growth spurt that dealt Estero an increase in overall property values of around 43 percent last year, she said.

"One of the things we've seen happen is there's a little more reluctance to develop in Bonita Springs because there's a new council," Gibbs said. "That's helped activity a little more than we expected."

Gibbs also said she was in favor of the Estero community plan. The plan, which was submitted to the county last month, provides a more specific growth and development blueprint for the community that gives Estero more control over how the community is built.

"I'm really glad you're doing it," Gibbs said. "You need to control your own destiny."

Gibbs said the county is considering improving the public notice procedure for hearings, increasing impact fees for parks and Emergency Management Services, and dropping the "bubble plan," vague development outlines, during the county's next round of Land Development Code amendments, which take place twice a year with the next round coming during December or January.




Albion, whose district includes the part of Estero east of U.S. 41, said the community is quickly catching up with the more well-known cities and areas throughout Southwest Florida.

"The fact that a five-start hotel is coming to Estero puts you in the class of Naples," Albion said.

As for the community plan, Albion said the county did not expect any delays as long as the entire community's wishes were represented.

"Doing a sector plan is like walking through a mine field," Albion said, adding that anyone whose opinion is not reflected in the plan may cause an explosion of sorts when Lee County commissioners vote on adopting the plan.

At the end of the meeting, Estero Fire District Chief Dennis Merrifield offered some development figures of his own



some development figures of his own.

Merrifield said from Oct. 1, 1999, through Sept. 30, that San Carlos Park added 235 residential units, while Bonita Springs added 864. Estero, he said, tallied 2,061.

"It's real clear that Estero is outpacing the entire area," Merrifield said.



[E-mail this story to a friend.](#)



[Format this story for printing.](#)



[Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)

Navigation:

[Go to today's Bonita section front](#)


[Go to our 7-day Bonita archive](#)

Also in today's Bonita section:

- [Appeals court orders resentencing of man convicted of vehicular homicide](#)
- [Councilman presents 2-county extension plan to residents](#)
- [Examiner recommends Lee commissioners deny request to build mall](#)
- [Flu shots offered in Bonita, Collier starting Oct. 27](#)
- [Fort Myers Beach Chamber threatens injunction to stop sign's removal](#)
- [Interim city manager reconsiders taking permanent position](#)
- [Kay Smith: Art exhibit features summer pieces](#)
- [Local Deaths](#)
- [Photo: Powder Puff winners](#)
- [Planning Agency head questions Estero's sector planning](#)
- [Rapid growth has Estero looking like a large city, county officials say](#)
- [Stone crabbers empty first traps of the season](#)

Feedback:

- [E-mail the naplesnews.com staff](#)
- [Write a letter to the editor](#)
- [View our directory of Daily News staff](#)
- [See our Help section for more assistance](#)



Postca:
Send an
to someb

Coupor
Save at l
business

Adverti
...on the
our rates

Subscr
Get the p
Daily New
door.

Math from Jerry

To print this page, select File then Print from your browser.

URL: <http://www.naplesnews.com/00/10/bonita/a2549a.htm>

Bonita | Bonita Daily News

   [Bonita front](#) | [Bonita archive](#) | [help](#)

Planning Agency head questions Estero's sector planning

Tuesday, October 17, 2000

By CHARLIE WHITEHEAD, Staff Writer

The chairman of the Local Planning Agency wants the agency to discuss whether Estero's recent sector planning process was done too rapidly, whether the taxpayer money used to create the plan is being used wisely and whether everyone involved in the process, including the head of the Estero Civic Association, must disclose all their lobbying efforts and related financial interests.

LPA Chairman Greg Stuart requests in his Oct. 9 letter to Lee County Planning Director Paul O'Connor that the issue of how the county treats sector plans be brought up at the next LPA meeting. With the Oct. 23 meeting canceled, that would be in November.

"As with all governmental and regulatory activities, community sector planning needs to be based upon open, fair and transparent governmental processes," Stuart wrote. "I hope that the (Lee County Commission), Staff and Lee County residents support the need for broad-based and transparent community planning processes that are not targeted towards special interests."

Sector planning involves creating a set of development guidelines tailored to a specific geographic area in the county. Pine Island, Fort Myers Beach and Buckingham have all gone through the sector planning process, and Estero residents late last month forwarded recommendations for the first phase of the community's sector plan to the county. The county contributed as much as \$30,000 to the planning process.

The money is being used to pay private planner Mitch Hutchcraft, who is developing the sector plan with the help of local residents.

Stuart said the plan was created much more rapidly than similar plans in the county and that the LPA and county staff need to discuss how taxpayer money is being used to finance the sector planning process and whether groups receiving public money should provide

meeting notices, minutes and financial reports.

Stuart also called in his letter for full financial disclosure of everyone involved in the sector planning process, saying he is "deeply concerned by the appearance of possible selective targeting in the development of the draft sector plan." He noted in his letter that the sector plan called for an "Estero Center" between the Brooks and U.S. 41 and for extending Sandy Lane to Williams Road. Both actions, he wrote, have the potential to financially benefit area landowners.

"All members of the steering committee and others in leadership roles need to fully disclose their financial and agency interests to assure that no special interest is being served," the letter said.

The letter specifically mentioned Meg Venceller, who chairs both the Estero Civic Association and Estero Chamber of Commerce board of directors.

"I am rather confused about the multiple roles of Meg Venceller," Stuart wrote. "It is my understanding that Ms. Venceller is neither a lawyer, planner, engineer, architect nor related development professional. Yet it is my direct understanding, supported independently by two other individuals, that for some time she has been presenting herself as a 'development consultant' at a rate of \$250 per hour."

Stuart, supported by Koreshan Unity President Charles Dauray, said Venceller has approached developers to offer her services as a development consultant on projects in the Estero area. Other development professionals working in Estero have declined comment, and Venceller said that is untrue and an effort by Stuart to sabotage the local planning effort to benefit one of his clients.

Stuart represents Koreshan Unity Foundation in its recent proposal for a multi-use development called Riverplace and World College of Life on its property at Corkscrew Road and U.S. 41. Though he said in the letter he is writing based on his responsibilities as chairman of the Local Planning Agency and not on behalf of any client, Stuart specifically mentioned as a concern the fact that one portion of the sector plan proposes a temporary moratorium for the U.S. 41/Highlands Avenue area because of concerns about historic preservation. That area includes the land the foundation wants to develop.

"If he thinks he's going to bully and intimidate the Estero community and derail the Estero sector plan he's mistaken," Venceller said. "What we've tried to do is manage growth responsibly instead of incorporating. If we're going to be bullied and intimidated we may have to."

Venceller said she does work in advertising and marketing and was approached by Dauray to work in support of the Koreshan proposal. Dauray and Stuart say she approached him.

O'Connor said as far as he knows there are no disclosure requirements for people involved in sector planning. The communities of Buckingham and Fort Myers Beach, before it incorporated, had sector plans approved and added to the county's own comprehensive growth management plan, and no such questions were raised. County commissioners who received Stuart's letter and had heard from Stuart and Venceller had varied reactions.

"I've spoken with Greg Stuart and he brought me information I haven't had time to verify," Commissioner John Manning said. "I think Estero is the best place to iron out those issues."

Manning said the board's role is simply to see the sector plan done, and done well.

Commissioner Andy Coy said he feels the planning process should be as open as possible.

"They all need to be very open and honest and upfront about who they are, who they represent and who they're paid by," he said. "We've created a quasi-city government, and it's taken on some of the authority of government."

Vancellor said she's told members of the Chamber and of the Civic Association of her work for some area developers. Community leaders were hesitant to comment, but Arnold Rosenthal and Larry Newell, both active in community matters like the planning effort, say she has not informed them of her work.

Stuart's letter to O'Connor included two letters from Newell to Commissioner Ray Judah in which Newell lobbies for an agency other than Estero Chamber of Commerce to take the lead role in the sector planning process.

Venceller said Stuart is trying to bring up insinuations of conflicts of interest among those involved in the planning effort so he can discredit people who might propose development guidelines that do not favor his clients.

"Mr. Stuart is abusing his office to protect his client," she said. "We're all familiar with the scandal associated with the LPA."

Several LPA members resigned in the past year after reports questioned their own potential conflicts of interest, as they voted on issues that affected their own developer clients. Stuart has been on the LPA for eight years. He was the agency's chairman then and remains its chairman now.

Stuart, though, said he just wanted to make sure the process wasn't tainted.

"Sector planning is very important," he said. "I would expect her to read the letter and try to understand the broader issues. Instead of character assassination, she ought to look at my record and my votes in support of sector planning. I insist sector planning be done in an

open and transparent manner."



[E-mail this story to a friend.](#)



[Format this story for printing.](#)



[Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)

Navigation:

[Go to today's Bonita section front](#)

[Go to our 7-day Bonita archive](#)

Also in today's Bonita section:

[Appeals court orders resentencing of man convicted of vehicular homicide](#)

[Councilman presents 2-county extension plan to residents](#)

[Examiner recommends Lee commissioners deny request to build mall](#)

[Flu shots offered in Bonita, Collier starting Oct. 27](#)

[Fort Myers Beach Chamber threatens injunction to stop sign's removal](#)

[Interim city manager reconsiders taking permanent position](#)

[Kay Smith: Art exhibit features summer pieces](#)

[Local Deaths](#)

[Photo: Powder Puff winners](#)

[Planning Agency head questions Estero's sector planning](#)

[Rapid growth has Estero looking like a large city, county officials say](#)

[Stone crabbers empty first traps of the season](#)

Feedback:

[E-mail the \[naplesnews.com\]\(http://naplesnews.com\) staff](#)

[Write a letter to the editor](#)

[View our directory of Daily News staff](#)

[See our Help section for more assistance](#)



Copyright © 2000 Naples Daily News. All rights reserved.

A Scripps Howard newspaper.

Please read our [user agreement](#) and [privacy policy](#).

... getting
the new clinic's telephone number, just in case he needs to schedule an appointment some day. The 82-year-old says he's in good health for now.

"I don't have anything particularly wrong with me," Smith said. "I just want to be prepared."

Vietnam War veteran Jeff Park, who works for the VA in Fort Myers, said, "A lot of (veterans) are looking forward to it."

A dedication ceremony is

... new doctor starting in November. And we will have all of them seen by one of the doctors by February."

The federal agency is leasing the 5,200 square feet of clinic space for three years with options to renew. Dempsey said she expects to hit the 2,000 patient mark by January. The clinic has enough room to have up to five physicians, and each physician will be assigned 1,000 patients.

"I think (this clinic) down here will be real busy," Dempsey said.

The number of out-of-town transports probably won't go down because the Naples clinic is offering only primary care services, he said. With the VA encouraging veterans to sign up with the VA medical system, if anything the county's transportation assistance program will need to be expanded, he said.

Kraley also has taken a look at the new Naples clinic.

"It's a nice location," he said. "The building has a little more room for expansion."

Koreshan

Continued from 1A

Association and Estero Citizens Community Organization, who previewed the plans Thursday. "It would be welcome to the area. If it's a conference center, in the truest sense of the word, and they're careful who they bring in, then I think we ought to back it."

Rosenthal was cautious, however. He said the plans are "dressed up in nice raiment" but he wants to be sure what he saw on paper is what he eventually sees on the ground.

"If it's a sheep in sheep's clothing, it's wonderful," he said. "If it's a wolf in sheep's clothing, that's different."

Dauray said he spent the past 14 months buying what was at one time Koreshan land so he could develop it true to the original group's vision, and it won't stray.

"It could have had several different owners for separate

pieces," he said. "That's rape it and scrape it and use it and abuse it. That's not my attitude."

In fact the plans call for keeping just over 45 percent of the site as open space, fully half of it in native plant species. Existing historic buildings and sites are to be restored and preserved, and a river buffer of from 125 to 140 feet will be established along 1,860 of the 2,000 feet of shoreline. The remainder will host a marina, restricted to canoes, kayaks and electric boats, and a riverfront restaurant.

The Koreshans own land on either side of longtime resident Ellen Peterson's home.

"Years ago I tried to talk Hedy into developing a pioneer village as a tourist attraction," Peterson said of Hedwig Michel, the last of the Koreshans, who died in 1982. "I think it would be a very good thing."

Peterson filed a legal challenge when Dauray's predecessor tried to build a bridge over the river in the late 1990s, but said if the current plans call for a footbridge she would have no objection.

Peterson said she could support the plans for a restaurant on the northern bank of the river, and said a little development would be OK if it resulted in preserving the rest of the river.

"It would be wonderful to have that part of the river protected," she said.

Jeanne Parks is manager of the Koreshan State Historic Site directly across U.S. 41. She said she's had a good working relationship with Dauray.

"We understand each other," she said. "He seems to be pretty open to a relationship with the park."

Parks said the plans to restore and remodel historic buildings sound good, as do plans to limit impact to the river and existing native species.

Larry Newell is past chairman of ECCO, and attended the sneak preview Thursday.

"I thought it to be a unique opportunity for the sector plan, which was started by ECCO," Newell said. "It could be the cornerstone of the community planning process."

REUSE THE NEWS

We are proud to use recycled newsprint...
more than 95% of the newsprint used
by the Naples Daily News is recycled paper.



Naples Daily News

...ley Buck,
Coast and
...ined some
...ht off the
...ood cause.
...natch their
...y estimated

...who help
...r we'll find
...d.

ant

...derground
...approved,
...problem at
...ten the at-
...er County
...er Authori-

...pers com-
...ity in Au-
...refused to
...ns to the
...t because
...f disposal

...aid hook-
...1 January
...l service.
...acity was
...lize cons-
...s at Wa-
...Rich
...letter to

...utility
...y agree-
...allow it
...he Wa-
...trucks
...ste as
...y plant
...l.

...mem-
...o sub-
...plete
...ees it
...8 and

...attor-
...pers
...nding
...war-
...sked
...new

h
a
st
su
da
ne
j
ASSO
By G
P
ort de
al, sa
Nels
en kil
y offi
hly c
n cent
lee th
The fi
sc also
aped
Shrapn
and del
g this t
e dropi
house
mi Mol
ht in the
ts indic
by Mu
assault
down the
spite at
is eyes w
head sw
said from
e got cau
o, witness
y Saddar
ors.
tally sho
olders ch
untains o
planes b
Jiliah Sa
PAO, Ph
ress



...hundreds of government troops
...had the rescue attempt Sept. 16 on
...tals," she said.

Planned Developments
for the Estero Community

| Project Name | Approved | Acres | Retail in Square Feet | Office in Square Feet | Residential Units | Hotel Rooms | Other Total Commercial in Square Feet | Community Facilities in Square Feet | ALF | Boat Slips | Warehouse Distribution |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----|---------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brook of Bonita DRI/CPD | 8/25/97 | 2,532 | | | 5,200 | 120 | 250,000 | 55,000 | | | |
| Creekside RPD/CPD | 5/2/94 | 143 | | | 500 | | 250,000 | | | | |
| Kersey-Smoot | 9/21/98 | 204 | | | 362 | | | | | 150 | |
| Marsh Landing | 9/6/95 | 121 | | | 404 | | | | | | |
| <i>Pelican Landing CPD/RPD</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>DRI</i> | 8/29/94 | 2,519 | 300,000 | 475,000 | 4,400 | 750 | | | | 215 | |
| Pelican Landing NE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RPD/DRI | 9/13/95 | 97 | | | 350 | | | | | | |
| River Place of Estero | pending | 49 | 175,000 | | 165 | 100 | | 80,000 | | | |
| San Marino Pines RPD | 3/14/88 | 116 | | | 452 | | | | | | |
| Simon Suncoast Mall | pending | 483 | 1,800,000 | 300,000 | 1,000 | 600 | | | 200 | | |
| Stonybrook | 6/17/85 | 806 | 200,000 | 100,000 | 1,840 | | | | | | |
| The Habitat CPD/RPD DRI | 10/13/86 | 1,009 | 100,000 | | 2,350 | | 20,000 | | | | |
| University Lake Village | 9/3/98 | 107 | 100,000 | | 508 | | 140,000 | | | | |
| Villages of County Creek | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RPD | 4/21/86 | 283 | | | 985 | | | | | | |
| West Bay Club | 3/18/96 | 864 | 2,500 | | 1,121 | | | | | | |
| West Bay Club/River Ridge | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RPD | 12/18/95 | 547 | | | 1,480 | | | | | | |
| Wildcat Run PUD | 2/22/82 | 584 | | | 650 | | | | | | |
| <i>Camargo Trust MPD</i> | 6/29/98 | 83 | 100,000 | | | 105 | 300,000 | | 125 | | |
| <i>Williams Place CPD</i> | 6/2/97 | - | | | | | 90,000 | | | | |
| <i>Estero Greens CPD</i> | 9/15/97 | 24 | 100,000 | | | 125 | 129,900 | | | | |
| <i>Tulip Associates CPD</i> | 3/20/00 | 13 | | | | | 130,500 | | | | |
| <i>Coconut Road MPD</i> | 11/16/98 | 46 | 250,000 | 50,000 | | 150 | | | | | |
| <i>Wayne Russel CPD</i> | 2/3/92 | 5 | | | | | 54,000 | | | | |
| <i>Breckenridge Prof. CPD</i> | 3/16/94 | 16 | 12,500 | 108,500 | | | | | | | |
| <i>Beasley Broadcasting CPD</i> | 4/25/88 | | | 5,000 | | | | | | | |
| <i>Corkscrew Village Shopping</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Cte CPD</i> | 2/13/89 | 17 | | | | | 105,000 | | | | |
| <i>South Estero Commercial</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Center CPD</i> | 2/13/89 | 16 | | | | | 205,000 | | | | |
| <i>Kristen Woods RPD/CPD</i> | 3/15/99 | 56 | | 170,000 | 220 | | | | | | |
| <i>Corkscrew Palms CPD</i> | 5/4/98 | 13 | | 100,000 | | | | | | | |
| <i>Corkscrew Crossings CPD</i> | 12/5/94 | 38 | 187,000 | | | 133 | | | | | |
| <i>Estero Interstate Commerce</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Park</i> | 3/20/00 | 48 | 140,000 | | | 250 | | | | | 20,000 |
| <i>Corkscrew Commerce</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Center CPD</i> | 7/17/00 | 21 | 100,000 | 30,000 | | 120 | | | | | |
| <i>Goodwill Store Adult</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Learning CTR</i> | 1/6/92 | 5 | | | | | 24,500 | | | | |
| <i>The Gardens of Estero DCI</i> | 8/16/99 | 69 | | | 692 | | 10,000 | | | | |

Planned Developments
for the Estero Community

| Project Name | Approved | Acres | Retail in Square Feet | Office in Square Feet | Residential Units | Hotel Rooms | Other Total Commercial in Square Feet | Community Facilities in Square Feet | ALF | Boat Slips | Warehouse Distribution |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------|
| Corlico CPD | 5/2/94 | 36 | 250,000 | 50,000 | | | | | | | |
| University Lake Village/ fka Corlico Villages | 9/3/98 | 107 | 100,000 | | 508 | | 140,000 | | | | |
| Corkscrew Woodlands RPD | 7/15/96 | 34 | | | 200 | | | | | | |
| Grove Lakes RPD (The Groves) | 5/9/88 | 37 | | | 73 | | | | | | |
| Spiegel CPD | 8/17/98 | 10 | 700 | | | | | | | | |
| Estero Lakes East RPD (Spring Ridge) | 12/12/88 | 29 | | | 82 | | | | | | |
| Corkscrew Hammock PUD | 12/11/89 | 50 | | | 250 | | | | | | |
| Breckenridgge PUD (fka Laguna Woods) | 9/9/85 | 103 | | | 617 | | | | | | |
| Breckenridge Ph V, VI & VII RPD | 4/15/96 | 10 | | | | | | | | | |
| Breckenridge Ph VIII | 10/18/99 | 20 | | | 160 | | | | | | |
| Nazarro RPD | 4/15/96 | 6 | | | 24 | | | | | | |
| Koreshan CPD | 10/1/99 | 10 | | 100,000 | | | | | | | |
| San Marino Pines (fka Allendale) RPD | 8/31/92 | 116 | | | 452 | | | | | | |
| Pelican Pointe RPD/Marsh Landing | 9/6/95 | 121 | | | 404 | | | | | | |
| Weeks Fish Camp RPD/MHPD | 9/9/91 | 22 | | | | | | | | | |
| Weeks CPD | 4/18/94 | 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 11,648 | 3,917,700 | 1,488,500 | 25,449 | 2,453 | 1,848,900 | 135,000 | 325 | 365 | 20,000 |
| Adjacent to Core Area | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Estero Golf Resort | pending | 315 | 200,000 | 15,000 | 600 | 150 | | | | | |
| The Vines PUD | 2/24/84 | 269 | | | 440 | | | | | | |
| Villages of Bernwood MPD | 9/15/97 | 155 | 80,000 | 60,000 | 595 | | | | | | |
| Unnamed--north of Villages of Country Creek | pending | 160 | | | 400 | | | | | | |
| Timberland & Tiburon MPD/DRI | 3/4/96 | 794 | 788,000 | | 2,895 | 200 | | | | | |
| Country Oaks RPD | 7/11/88 | 38 | | | 123 | | | | | | |
| Total | | 1,732 | 1,068,000 | 75,000 | 5,053 | 350 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Grand Total | | 13,380 | 4,985,700 | 1,563,500 | 30,502 | 2,803 | 1,848,900 | 135,000 | 325 | 365 | 20,000 |

ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING PANEL, INC.

December 20, 2001

Mr. Paul O'Connor
Director of Planning
Lee County Department of Community Development
1500 Monroe Street, Fort Myers, FL

RE: Estero Community Plan Amendment to the Lee Plan

As a follow up to our December 14, 2001 conversation concerning intent and potential unintended consequences, I recommend the following language changes to the August 29, 2001 version of the Proposed BoCC Sponsored Amendment to The Lee Comprehensive Plan, CPA2000-19.

Policy 19.2.2: Please strike the last sentence, "Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential."

Policy 19.2.5: Please strike the word "free-standing" in the second line and insert the words "not associated with a Restaurant, LDC Group III" between the word "lounges" and the semi-colon which precedes the word "and" in the third line.

*Please note that the intent here is to prohibit nightclubs as well as bar or cocktail lounges which are not an integral part of an associated restaurant, whether or not the building which houses that restaurant is free-standing or part of another structure, shopping center or plaza.

Policy 19.4.1: ^{Indispensable} In the third paragraph, please strike the words "within the Estero Planning Boundaries" and replace with, "whenever possible, within the Estero Fire District Boundary, and/or within one mile beyond the Estero Fire district Boundary."

Please let me know if the above recommendations are satisfactory to Staff. I am hopeful that making these changes will not delay the Adoption Process. Please advise me if that will not be the case.

On Behalf of The Estero Community Planning Committee

Neal E. Noethlich

Neal Noethlich, Chairman

CPA2000-19

9/7/01

Neil Noetlich called Roger Wilburn at the Department of Community Affairs on Friday, 9/7/01, at 11:10 a.m.

He explained that the surveys in their binder were summarized and asked if DCA needed the individual surveys that were filled out.

Roger Wilburn told him that as long as it was summarized, DCA would not need to receive the individual surveys.

Witnessed by Janet Miller on 9/7/01

From: <NEN13@aol.com>
To: <ddelisi@vanday.com>, <noblema@leegov.com>
Date: 6/20/01 1:36AM
Subject: Comments on Latest Estero Plan Language

Dan and Matt, First allow me to thank you both for the attention to detail you have both undertaken in crafting the final language. That said, I do have some comments which I must share with you, albeit at the last moment.

19.1.1: Can we add the words "and lighting" after the word "signage"?

19.1.6: 2003 may be too late for FDOT consideration, since their representative stated during an ECCO meeting that lighting and landscaping proposals need to be addressed early on in the design phase for the roadway. I think we may have to do this earlier than end of 2003 as the language will allow.

19.1.7: Why was the date changed until the end of 2004? Is it simply due to projected human resource availability, or is there something deeper than that?

19.2 Can we add the word "lighting" after the word "architecture"?

19.2.5: I believe that even one acre may be too much. Are we assuming that the economics of a one acre limitation on outdoor display will be negative to car lots, Big box stores, Boat dealers, flea markets, tractor and golf cart dealers, etc.?

19.3.2: End of 2003 is too late.

19.4.1: End of 2003 is too late.

19.5.1: Please put this back in. We can negotiate what types of documentation are necessary. We recognize that only a limited amount of the total info DCD processes is necessary for our needs.. In addition I think we would be willing to accept a phased in approach and the use of the county web site as the source for much of what we feel we need. But to strike it out completely is unsatisfactory, not just to me but to many of my colleagues, who have publicly stated this as a major need. I truly hope you can come up with something here!

19.5.2 DITTO comments made to 19.5.1

19.5.3: Okay for now. Let's see how this works before we reach for too much.

19.6.6: I won't hold out for this for fear of running aground with the County Staff and jeopardizing approvals within the review process. However, for the record, I wish to state my disappointment that Staff cannot see their way to "monitoring" truck traffic. That is, to my recall, exactly what the BoCC said would be done at the time they turned down the request of many Estero citizens and groups that certain limitations be placed on truck traffic on Corkscrew Road.

I fully recognize the need to satisfy both County Staff and the Estero Community, as well as others, in what we are attempting. I also realize that

we need to show much unanimity to both the LPA and the BoCC. You can count on me to try to do both.

Regards, Neal Noethlich

CC: <doneslick@worldnet.att.net>, <NEN13@aol.com>

LEE COUNTY
RECEIVED

01 JUN 15 AM 11:48

ESTERO CONCERNED CITIZENS ORGANIZATION

June 14, 2001

COUNTY
PUB. WORKS. CNTR.
2ND FLOOR

Mr. Paul O'Connor
Lee County Director of Planning

Dear Paul,

The discussion among the County Commissioners during the May 14th public hearing on the Estero Greens Golf Resort suggests to us that the time may be right for County Planning staff to study how current landscaping, signage, lighting, noise, appearance and location standards can be improved for gasoline stations, car washes, convenience stores, and fast food facilities. One could reasonably request that the same should be done for auto dealerships, boat dealerships, and other similar businesses which often do not make a positive contribution to the aesthetics of Lee county.

Estero and Lee County are blessed with many attractive offices and retail buildings along commercial corridors. However most gasoline stations and other businesses referenced above too often detract from the attractive appearance of most other newer commercial buildings, and visually scar our commercial corridors. Clearly, appearance standards for these types of properties is too low. We hope that you will agree that these standards should be reevaluated and upgraded as soon as possible. We also believe location standards for these types of businesses should be reevaluated, as well.

We hope to deal effectively with these issues in Estero through our Community Plan and the LDC changes associated with the Plan. As specific examples of what we do not care for, I have attached copies of recent photographs of gasoline stations in Estero. These absolutely do not measure up to the level we hope to establish for future additions to our Estero landscape. We can point to other establishments, such as the Arby's fast food facility on Corkscrew Road as additional examples which do not meet the standards we hope to implement into code for Estero. We would hope that increased standards could be implemented across all of Lee County as well.

You can count on our support of strong recommendations for changes in the current appearance standards and for careful consideration of acceptable locations along roadways within our boundaries.

Sincerely,

Neal E Noethlich

Neal Noethlich

Chairman

Copy to (w/o attachments):

Mary Gibbs and Lee County Commissioners

CC: MATT HOBLE

From: Kim Trebatoski
To: Noble, Matthew
Date: 6/11/01 1:39PM
Subject: Estero Community Plan

Matt - Some thoughts to ponder...

Obj. 19.4: *The county cannot determine where wetland mitigation occurs per F.S. 163.3184(6)(c). Lee County will encourage on-site preservation of indigenous plant communities and listed species habitat. When site constraints are such that off-site mitigation of indigenous areas is deemed necessary, the mitigation will be of similar habitat provided within the Estero Community Boundaries.*

Policy 19.4.2: *Is this appropriate, as the Conservation 2020 initiative is for county wide acquisition. If it is appropriate, shouldn't rare and unique uplands be targeted for preservation as well?*

Policy 19.6.1 & 19.6.2: *DELETE. Estero Community organizations or individuals can join the Estero Bay Buddies to participate in helping develop the Estero Bay Preserves. The manager of Koreshan State Park can be contacted for volunteer opportunities.*

Kim Trebatoski
Senior Environmental Planner
DCD - Planning/Environmental Sciences
trebatkm@leegov.com
941-479-8183
FAX 941-479-8319

992-1200
Aug 15 9:30am

Vision Statement:

"To establish a community that embraces its historic heritage, while carefully planning for future growth resulting from Florida Gulf Coast University, the Southwest Florida International Airport, growing population and unique natural environment. Estero's growth will be planned as a village, establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment, while protecting and encouraging residential neighborhoods that encourage a sense of belonging. Weaving the community together will be carefully crafted limitations on strip commercial uses, inappropriate signage and certain undesired commercial uses, while additional design guidelines will be established to ensure attractive landscaping, streetscaping, architectural standards, and unified access points. The implementation of this Vision will help reduce the conflict between residential and commercial areas, as well as allow Estero to emerge as a vibrant Lee County Village."

GOAL19: ESTERO

To protect the character, natural resources and quality of life in Estero by establishing minimum aesthetic requirements, managing the location and intensity of future commercial and residential uses, and providing greater opportunities for public participation in the land development approval process.

Objective 19.1: COMMUNITY CHARACTER. The Estero community will draft and submit regulations, policies and discretionary actions affecting the character and aesthetic appearance of Estero for Lee County adopt and enforce to help create a visually attractive community.

Policy 19.1.1: By the end of 2002, The Estero community will draft and submit regulations, policies for Lee County to review, amend or establish as Land Development Code regulations that provide for enhanced landscaping along roadway corridors, greater buffering and shading of parking areas, signage consistent with the Community Vision, and architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: Lee County is discouraged from approving any deviation that would result in a reduction of landscaping, buffering, signage guidelines or compliance with architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.3: Lee County will work, through the permitting process, with private property owners to establish incentives for voluntarily bringing older projects into compliance with the regulations adopted as a result of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 19.1.4: Lee County and the Estero Community ~~shall~~ will work in conjunction with private developers, public agencies and community service providers to establish one or several town commons that encourages the location of a post office, public meeting hall, outdoor plaza, governmental offices, medical providers and recreational opportunities.

Policy 19.1.5: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to enhance the Koreshan State Historic Site in such a manner that it is more visually integrated with the Community along US 41 and provides for enhanced pedestrian/bicycle access.

Policy 19.1.6: By 2003, the Estero community will draft a corridor management plan for the Estero US 41 corridor to advance development in a manner that promotes a safe, high quality urban environment. Plan elements will include roadway and median landscape standards, residential buffering standards, access management guidelines, street lighting sidewalks, and insuring safe and effective pedestrian crossings within the context of a comprehensive pedestrian and bikeway system.

Policy 19.1.7: By 2003 Lee County will evaluate historic resources to be adopted under Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code.

Objective 19.2: COMMERCIAL LAND USES. Existing and future county regulations, land use interpretations, policies, zoning approvals, and administrative actions must recognize the unique conditions and preferences of the Estero Community to ensure that commercial areas maintain a unified and pleasing aesthetic/visual quality in landscaping, architecture and signage, provide for employment opportunities, while discouraging uses that are not compatible with adjacent uses and have significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Policy 19.2.1: All new commercial development that requires rezoning within the Estero Community must be reviewed as a Commercial Planned Development.

Policy 19.2.2: All retail uses ~~shall~~ must be in compliance with the Retail Site Location Standards. A finding of a "Special Case" must demonstrate a community benefit in addition to the requirements outlined in Policy 6.12(8). Retail Uses along Corkscrew Road (outside of the Nodes identified on Map 19) are required to be submitted as a component of an MPD with at least one use being residential.

Policy 19.2.3: By the end of 2002 the Estero Community will submit regulations that encourage or incentivize mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road for Lee County to review, amend or adopt.

Policy 19.2.4: With the exception of Commercial Nodes identified on Map 19, Lee County ~~shall~~ will discourage new retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway, in favor of ~~service office~~ and residential uses.

Policy 19.2.5: ~~The Estero Community will propose regulations for Lee County to review, amend or adopt that~~ prohibits "detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code), free-standing nightclubs or lounges, or retail uses that require outdoor display in excess of one acre, storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

Policy 19.2.6: ~~By the end of 2002, Lee County must review, amend or adopt regulations that~~ encourages commercial developments within the Estero Community to provide interconnect opportunities with adjacent commercial uses in order to minimize access points onto primary road corridors; and residential developments to provide interconnect opportunities with commercial areas, including but not limited to bike paths and pedestrian access ways.

Objective 19.3: RESIDENTIAL USES: Lee County ~~shall~~ must protect and enhance the residential character of the Estero Community by strictly evaluating adjacent uses, natural resources, access and recreational or open space, and requiring compliance with enhanced buffering requirements.

Policy 19.3.1: In order to meet the future needs of Florida Gulf Coast University, Lee County encourages higher density residential developments, with a mix of unit types, affordable housing and retail uses in close proximity to Florida Gulf Coast University, between Three Oaks Parkway and I-75.

Policy 19.3.2: By the end of 2003, The Estero community will draft and submit regulations and policies for Lee County to review, amend or adopt as regulations in the Land Development Code to provide for greater buffering between distinctly different adjacent commercial and residential properties, modified however when a project is of mixed use nature.

Policy 19.3.3: Lee County ~~shall~~ will protect the large lot residential areas between Koreshan Parkway and Corkscrew by requiring significant buffers between existing lots and higher density residential developments, and/or the placement of transitional density to adjacent units between the uses.

~~Policy 19.3.4: No property within the Estero Community may be rezoned to RVPD or MHPD where it is in high hazard areas in accordance with section 34-784 of the Land Development Code.~~

Objective 19.4: Natural Resources: County regulations, policies, and discretionary actions affecting Estero must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats.

Policy 19.4.1: By the end of 2003, Lee County ~~shall~~ will review, amend or adopt Lee Plan or Land Development Code regulations to provide the following:

- All future development proposals adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries ~~shall~~ must include floodplain protection plans prior to zoning approval.
- All new development adjacent to the Estero River or its tributaries must provide a minimum of a 50' buffer which preserves all of the native vegetation within that buffer, adjacent to the top of bank, with the exception of passive recreational uses. This is intended to prevent degradation of water quality within these natural water bodies.
- Lee County ~~shall~~ will encourage that when off-site mitigation of indigenous areas, wetland impacts or wildlife habitat impacts is approved for site development that the mitigation will be provided within the Estero Community Boundaries.
- Lee County ~~shall~~ will provide significant incentives (for example increased density, Transfer of Development Rights, etc) for the protection of wetlands,

historic flow ways, native habitat or other significant natural resource within the Estero Community.

Policy 19.4.2: Lee County ~~shall~~ will focus acquisition efforts in Estero on environmentally sensitive lands east of I-75 and along the Estero Bay.

Policy 19.4.3: Lee County, or another authorized agency, will work to provide alternative irrigation sources (re-use, Aquifer Storage and Recovery Water, or mixed-non-potable) or financial incentives to provide non-potable water to uses within the Estero Community. This is desired to discourage the proliferation of private, single user wells.

Policy 19.4.4: Lee County will continue to enforce Wellfield protection requirements, monitoring, and other applicable provisions to ensure that future wellfield drawdown zones are protected.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County ~~shall~~ will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, zoning approvals, and development orders.

Policy 19.5.1: Lee County ~~shall~~ will register groups within the Estero Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, development code amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates.

Policy 19.5.2: Lee County ~~shall~~ will establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Community, in coordination with zoning staff, ~~shall~~ must conduct one public workshop within two weeks of the project being found sufficient.

Objective 19.6: COMMUNITY FACILITIES. Lee County ~~shall~~ will work with the Estero Community to provide or facilitate the provision of a broad mix of Community Facilities.

Policy 19.6.1: Lee County and the Estero Community ~~shall~~ will work with the State of Florida to provide appropriate passive recreational opportunities within the Sahdev Property, potentially enhanced by a public/private partnership. This should include easy access, parking, trails, and other non-intrusive uses.

Policy 19.6.2: Lee County and the Estero Community will work with the State of Florida to encourage the integration of Koreshan State Historic Site into the fabric of the community. This may include landscaping, aesthetically pleasing archways along US 41, the provision of a "gateway" at US 41 and Corkscrew Road and enhanced pedestrian access, or programmed activities for the community.

Policy 19.6.3: Lee County will work with the community and private landowners to identify opportunities to maintain public access to the Estero River and Estero Bay.

Policy 19.6.4: Lee County will work with the community to ensure that the development of the Estero Bonita Springs Community Park is integrated into the surrounding development and open space areas. The concept would be for the park to act as a hub, connected to other open space/recreational opportunities through pedestrian or bicycle linkages, either along public rights of way or through adjacent developments.

Policy 19.6.5: Lee County will assist the Estero Community in identifying and developing a town commons that provides opportunities for public gathering, recreation, civic activities, and the distribution of public services, including a post office, license bureau, tax collectors office, police sub-station and or fire station.

Policy 19.6.6: In order to protect health, safety, welfare and community character, Lee County will continue to monitor truck traffic along Corkscrew Road (from Alico Road to US 41) as a connecting road to US 41 and I-75, to evaluate the impact on adjacent residential communities.

Modifications to current Lee Plan Provisions:

The following section contains proposed amendments to existing Lee Plan provisions to better implement the intent of the Estero Community Plan.

Policy 6.1.2.10: The Board of County Commissioners may approve applications for minor commercial centers that do not comply with the location standards for such centers, but which are consistent with duly adopted CRA and Community plans.

Policy 6.1.2.1(e): When developed as part of a mixed use planned development, and meeting the use limitations, modified setback standards, signage limitations and landscaping provisions, retail uses may deviate from the locational requirements and maximum square footage limitations, subject to conformance with the Estero Community Plan as outlined in Policies 19.2.3 and 19.2.4, and through approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

Vision Statement: Amend the Vision Statement to reflect the Vision Statement developed for the Estero Community.

From: Timothy Jones
To: Chumley, Benjamin
Date: 4/18/01 9:06AM
Subject: Re: Estero Community Planning

Ben,

It is our opinion that it would be illegal to provide impact fee reductions as an incentive for any purpose, much less one totally unrelated to the purpose of the impact fees. I would strongly recommend that the Board not adopt any such language in the Lee Plan.

Please let me know if you need anything further from us.

Tim

Timothy Jones
Assistant County Attorney
Lee County, Florida
Phone: 941-335-2236 Fax: 941-335-2606
Email: jonest@leegov.com

>>> Benjamin Chumley 04/18/01 08:43AM >>>

Tim - The draft of the Estero Community Plan has proposed to add a policy to the Lee Plan that would provide for impact fee reductions, and other incentives, in exchange for the protection of environmentally sensitive areas in Estero. The specific language they proposed is as follows:

Lee County shall provide significant incentives (increased density, impact fee reductions, Transfer of Development Rights, etc.) for the protection of wetlands, flow ways, native habitat, or other significant natural resources within the Estero Community.

This policy raised a red flag to us. Could you advise us of any legal problems that might arise from using reduced impact fees as an incentive in this case? We are already saying this policy is a bad idea because there is no need to provide incentives to protect areas that are already protected under the Lee Plan and LDC. There just seems to be a problem with providing a reduced impact fee that is collected for one purpose, such as transportation or fire protection, and using this incentive in exchange for a completely different purpose such as the protection of natural resources. Is this legal? Any advice you can provide us on the legal impacts of this proposed policy would be appreciated. Thanks.

Ben Chumley
Planner - Lee County Department of Community Development
chumlebd@leegov.com
Phone: 941-479-8365
FAX: 941-479-8319

CC: Noble, Matthew



Department of Environmental Protection

Jeb Bush
Governor

Koreshan State Historic Site
PO Box 7
Estero, FL 33928
(941)992-0311

David B. Struhs
Secretary

September 25, 2000

Mr. Mitchel A. Hutchcraft
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907

LEE COUNTY
RECEIVED
03 SEP 27 AM 9:03
PUBLIC AFFAIRS
OFFICE

Dear Mr. Hutchcraft,

I have taken the time to review the Preliminary Draft of The Estero Community Plan and have the following comments:

The state park should be referred to as Koreshan State Historic Site throughout the document.

The Koreshan Unity Settlement is a National Historic District. The portion of the Koreshan Unity Settlement Historic District found in Koreshan State Historic Site is located within a 40 acre parcel adjacent to US Highway 41. The District extends to the east, across US Highway 41 on the grounds currently managed by the Koreshan Unity Foundation. The total acreage of the state park is 192.6 acres. Mound Key State Archaeological Site a 166.6 acre parcel found on the island of Mound Key is located at the mouth of the Estero River and is also managed by staff at Koreshan S.H.S. Accessible by boat, Mound Key is a highly significant resource that should be considered in this plan as well.

Twelve historic structures, seven landscape features, extensive artifact and archival collections are maintained by the park. The Koreshan Unity Settlement is not maintained by the state as a "religious shrine". The national register nomination form prepared by the Department of State, Division of Historic Resources in 1975 described the significance of the site as follows:

"The physical remains of the Koreshan community are preserved because they represent a unique philosophical and religious movement, because they illustrate a cooperative settlement of the past era and because they are remnants of a pioneer community which, in many ways, typified life on the south Florida frontier around the turn of the twentieth century. The extant gardens are of value to tropical horticulturalists."

Accurate representation of the site is crucial to the support and success of community planning efforts.

"Protect, Conserve and Manage Florida's Environment and Natural Resources"

Mitchel Hutchcraft
September 25, 2000
Page 2

Management guidelines for the park are described in Unit Management Plans for both parks. Unit plan development has directly involved input from community representation in a DEP Advisory Groups. The Advisory Group for the Koreshan State Historic Site Unit Management Plan met in March, 2000 to provide input in the development of the current plan.

Unit Plans provide a management program overview, a description of the resources as well as conceptual land use plans that guide activities associated with natural and cultural resource management and any facility development. Any needs, uses or facility development described in the community plan which directly involve the use of state lands associated with these parks should reflect the management direction described in the plan. If you would like to review a copy of the unit plan, please let me know.

Policy 19.1.5 and Policy 19.6.2 creation of a public plaza/interpretive area for vehicular access would be difficult with the congestion, noise and traffic levels that currently exist. Safety concerns at the junction of US Highway 41 and Corkscrew Road would present serious drawbacks. Pedestrian/bicycle access to the park from US Highway 41, along Corkscrew Road is currently non-existent and is desperately needed to provide resident access into the park. Any proposal to consider a change in the current park access must take into account traffic speed and flow, the size of vehicles that regularly enter the park as well as the number of vehicles that attend special events. Noise levels and traffic vibration emanating from US Highway 41 have raised concerns for the need for landscaping, fences and walls to protect the cultural resources as well as restore the tranquility of the park setting. The park is willing to work closely with the community with those goals in mind.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments during the process of developing this plan. Strong community support has served Koreshan State Historic Site well during my tenure as Park Manager. I look forward to creating a stronger relationship with the residents of Estero by continuing to work with them.

Sincerely



Jeanne M. Parks
Park Manager

Cc: Michael K. Murphy, Chief, Bureau of Parks, District 4
Gloria M. Sajgo, Principal Planner, Lee County
Bill Grace, President, Koreshan Unity Alliance
file



Naples Daily News

Monday, September 25, 2000

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA EDITION www.naplesnews.com

25 cents a copy

Mary Pearl
Matt
FYI
blow

KORESHAN UNITY FOUNDATION

Group plans development at historic site

By CHARLIE WHITEHEAD
Staff Writer

It's not precisely what Cyrus Teed envisioned when he settled with his band of hollow-Earthers in Estero in the 1890s, but the heirs of the Koreshan legacy have development plans for the intersection of U.S. 41 and Corkscrew Road they think would make Teed proud.

The Koreshan Unity Foundation is a not-for-profit group dedicated to pre-

serving the heritage of the original Koreshans. The Koreshans located in Estero around 1894, settling much of the area and laying claim to around 300 acres as far away as Fort Myers Beach. They were believers in "cellular cosmogony," Teed's theory was that the Earth was a hollow sphere with humans living on the inside of the sphere. Teed was known as "Kore-sh" to other commune members.

The modern-day group and its president, Charles Dauray, are announcing

plans today for a project called Riverplace, a mixed-use endeavor centered around World College of Life, a symposium and retreat center, on four distinct parcels totaling 50 acres straddling the Estero River.

In addition to the center, the plans call for 175,000 square feet of commercial uses, including a low-intensity marina on the northern banks of the river, 165 residential units and 100 hotel rooms. Greg Stuart, the local professional planner who's

spent more than a year fashioning the development plan, explained the residential and hotel units would actually be dormitory and transient-style lodgings for use by the retreats and symposiums expected to make use of the new facilities.

"It's a unique opportunity for the foundation and for Estero, and it dovetails nicely with the sector plan," Dauray said. "We have a good team, and we hope the community realizes what we want to accomplish."


The sector plan is the community plan Estero is putting together to add to Lee County's comprehensive plan.

Dauray met Thursday with community leaders to give them a sneak peek at the plans. The reaction seems positive, if guarded.

"If as the plan says it will be an honor to the Koreshans, then fine," said Arnold Rosenthal, a member of Estero Civic

See **KORESHAN**, Page **8A**

SHARING A SUNSET



DEP warns of more problems at troubled sewer plant

By EDIC STARS

ley Buck, Coas, and ned some t off the od cause. atch their estimated

who help we'll find d.

ant

derground

approved, roblem at en the at- r County r Authori-

ers com- ty in Au- fused to is to the because 'disposal

id hook- January service. city was ze con- at Wa- Rich etter to

utility agree- llow it ie Wa- trucks ste as plant

mem-) sub- plete es it and

attor- pers ding war- sked new

the new clinic's telephone number, just in case he needs to schedule an appointment the day. The 82-year-old says he's in good health for now.

"I don't have anything particularly wrong with me," Smith said. "I just want to be prepared."

Vietnam War veteran Jeff Park, who works for the VA in Fort Myers, said, "A lot of (veterans) are looking forward to it."

A dedication ceremony is

ing in November. And we will have all of them seen by one of the doctors by February."

The federal agency is leasing the 5,200 square feet of clinic space for three years with options to renew. Dempsey said she expects to hit the 2,000 patient mark by January. The clinic has enough room to have up to five physicians, and each physician will be assigned 1,000 patients.

"I think (this clinic) down here will be real busy," Dempsey said.

The number of out-of-town sports probably won't go down because the Naples clinic is offering only primary care services, he said. With the VA encouraging veterans to sign up with the VA medical system, if anything the county's transportation assistance program will need to be expanded, he said.

Kraley also has taken a look at the new Naples clinic.

"It's a nice location," he said. "The building has a little more room for expansion."

Koreshan

Continued from 1A

Association and Estero Citizens Community Organization, who previewed the plans Thursday. "It would be welcome to the area. If it's a conference center, in the truest sense of the word, and they're careful who they bring in, then I think we ought to back it."

Rosenthal was cautious, however. He said the plans are "dressed up in nice raiment" but he wants to be sure what he saw on paper is what he eventually sees on the ground.

"If it's a sheep in sheep's clothing, it's wonderful," he said. "If it's a wolf in sheep's clothing, that's different."

Dauray said he spent the past 14 months buying what was at one time Koreshan land so he could develop it true to the original group's vision, and it won't stray.

"It could have had several different owners for separate

pieces," he said. "That's rape it and scrape it and use it and abuse it. That's not my attitude."

In fact the plans call for keeping just over 45 percent of the site as open space, fully half of it in native plant species. Existing historic buildings and sites are to be restored and preserved, and a river buffer of from 125 to 140 feet will be established along 1,860 of the 2,000 feet of shoreline. The remainder will host a marina, restricted to canoes, kayaks and electric boats, and a riverfront restaurant.

The Koreshans own land on either side of longtime resident Ellen Peterson's home.

"Years ago I tried to talk Hedy into developing a pioneer village as a tourist attraction," Peterson said of Hedwig Michel, the last of the Koreshans, who died in 1982. "I think it would be a very good thing."

Peterson filed a legal challenge when Dauray's predecessor tried to build a bridge over the river in the late 1990s, but said if the current plans call for a footbridge she would have no objection.

Peterson said she could support the plans for a restaurant on the northern bank of the river, and said a little development would be OK if it resulted in preserving the rest of the river.

"It would be wonderful to have that part of the river protected," she said.

Jeanne Parks is manager of the Koreshan State Historic Site directly across U.S. 41. She said she's had a good working relationship with Dauray.

"We understand each other," she said. "He seems to be pretty open to a relationship with the park."

Parks said the plans to restore and remodel historic buildings sound good, as do plans to limit impact to the river and existing native species.

Larry Newell is past chairman of ECCO, and attended the sneak preview Thursday.

"I thought it to be a unique opportunity for the sector plan, which was started by ECCO," Newell said. "It could be the cornerstone of the community planning process."

REUSE THE NEWS

We are proud to use recycled newsprint.... more than 95% of the newsprint used by the Naples Daily News is recycled paper.



Naples Daily News



Thousands of government troops... she said... island at the coun- rescue attempt Sept. 16 on tails.

h a si su da ne J ASSE BY G P rt de al, sa' Nels en kil y offi c hly c n cent n the fi The fi res also pped Shrapn and del g this t e dropi 'e house ' nni Mo' it in the ts indic by Mu assault down the spite at is eyes w head sw said from e got cau o, witness y Saddare ors. tally sho oldiers ch untains o planes b Ullah Sat PAO, Ph press MEZ

To: M. Noble

FAX COVER SHEET

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.
Attorneys at Law

MUhle@humphreyandknott.com

1625 HENDRY STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 2449
FORT MYERS, FL 33902-2449

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722
TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446

TIME: TOTAL PAGES INCLUDING COVER PAGE: 4

DATE: September 25, 2000

TO: Mary Gibbs 479-8319
: Paul O'Connor 479-8319

FROM: Matt Uhle

COMMENTS: Estero Community Plan

#:6533.000

ATTORNEY'S INITIALS: MDU

ORIGINAL: Mailed- _____ Federal Expressed- _____ Held in File- XX

SHOULD YOU HAVE PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS TRANSMISSION, PLEASE CALL SENDER AT (941) 334-2722.

THIS FAX SENT FROM FAX # (941) 334-1446 / (941) 334-2801 / (941) 334-8458 XX/ by: ZW

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: The information contained in this facsimile message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copy of this telecopy is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the united states postal service. Thank you.

G:\MDU\zw\MDUFAX.wpd

HUMPHREY & KNOTT

JAMES T. HUMPHREY
 GEORGE H. KNOTT *†
 GEORGE L. CONSOER, JR.**
 MARK A. EBELINI
 GAREY F. BUTLER

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
 ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
 1625 HENDRY STREET (33901)
 P. O. BOX 2449
 FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33902-2449

THOMAS B. HART
 MARK A. HOROWITZ
 MATTHEW D. UHLE
 H. ANDREW SWETT

* Board Certified Civil Trial Lawyer
 ** Board Certified Real Estate Lawyer
 † Board Certified Business Litigation Lawyer

TELEPHONE (941) 334-2722

TELECOPIER (941) 334-1446

MUhle@humphreyandknot.com

DIRECTOR OF ZONING AND
 LAND USE PLANNING
 MICHAEL E. ROEDER, AICP

September 22, 2000

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
 Vanasse & Daylor
 12730 New Brittany Blvd. Suite 600
 Fort Myers, FL 33907

Re: Estero Community Plan

Dear Mitch:

Our firm represents Koreshan Unity Foundation, Inc., the owner of several parcels consisting of approximately 50 acres in an area bounded by Corkscrew Road, Sandy Lane, U.S. 41, and County Road (a local street located north of the river). One of these parcels contains historic resources; the remainder do not. KUF was and is responsible for the preservation of the culture and history of the original Koreshans; this was done, in part, through the donation of 340 acres that is now the state park. KUF is, and always will be, sensitive to the need to protect the historic character of the area.

KUF, like all non-profits, has to generate revenues to pay its bills. To that end, it has reacquired several properties that were formerly owned by the Foundation. These properties do not contain historic resources. We have been working on a very complicated zoning application over the last year that includes both the historic areas and the reacquired parcels in an effort to assist the Foundation to continue to accomplish its goals. The application will be filed September 22nd.

The application is consistent with the overall objectives of your proposed community plan in a variety of ways, including the following:

1. The application is for a mixed-use development which contains residential, commercial, and community facility uses;
2. The plan shows an Estero River Management Zone and Buffer Area with very limited permitted uses;

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

3. The plan contains open space in a percentage that significantly exceeds the requirements in the LDC;
4. The proposal includes a landscape betterment plan for property along Corkscrew Road, Sandy Lane and U.S. 41 with special limitations on signage;
5. The plan is consistent with your general concept of village-style development along Corkscrew Road; and
6. The plan preserves the historic character of the parcel to which you refer as the "Theater in the Woods" tract.

Unfortunately, your proposed community plan contains several policies that are inconsistent with our MCP, including the following:

1. Policy 19.1.2: This policy appears to prohibit the use of landscape betterment plans along Corkscrew Road, which is inconsistent with the County Commission's recent decision to approve them as deviations. It should be deleted.
2. Policy 19.1.6 (shown as 19.1.5): The draft plan does not contain a map showing the "Historic Area," so it is impossible for us to determine the precise impact of this policy on the KUF property. We do not know if the "Highlands Avenue/US 41 area" includes the KUF property located at the intersection of U.S. 41 and County Road. We strongly object to the policy as it is currently written and to any notion that the proposed rezoning should be delayed until a "comprehensive Historic Development Overlay can be developed." Since our MCP protects all of the historic resources on the site, there is no reason to delay the zoning case, particularly since we started working on it even before there was any discussion about a community plan. Please delete the second sentence.
3. Policy 19.2.2: As will be explained more thoroughly at next week's public showing of the Foundation Master Plan, the project hinges on a special case finding. The parcel and the plan contain numerous unusual features that justify the special case finding including, but not limited to, the protection of the "Theater in the Woods" tract from large scale commercial uses in spite of its location at the intersection of two arterials. We do not see how this policy accomplishes your objective of encouraging small-scale, attractive, village-type commercial development along Corkscrew Road. We strongly object to this policy, which should be deleted.

Mr. Mitch Hutchcraft
September 22, 2000

4. Policy 19.2.3: This policy should not apply to property that is in the Urban Community FLUM category. Map 19 (which, incidentally, has very limited regulatory significance) does not show a node at US 41 and Corkscrew Road, but the presence of a large shopping center at the southeast corner of that intersection makes it obvious that the subject property is suitable for commercial uses in excess of the minor commercial standard.
5. Policy 19.4.1 The policy is vague and unenforceable by Lee County in that all relevant rules are under the jurisdiction of SFWMD. As such, the policy should be deleted.
6. Policy 19.6.3: We do not intend to "convert" the historic resources on the property to other uses. We are, however, proposing a wide range of residential, commercial, and community facilities uses on the various parcels. The language in this policy is too general to permit us to draw a conclusion as to whether it is consistent with our MCP.

It is my understanding that Greg Stuart will be briefing you on the project on September 25th. We are more than willing to provide you with a copy of our zoning application if you would find it helpful in your review of these issues. We can also provide you with information about the historic resources on the property, and we can even give you a tour of the site if you like. We are concerned, however, that these policies were drafted without any detailed knowledge of the KUF property or of our plan. We do not believe that the plan should go forward with the current policies without additional data and review, along with input from the public including, but not limited to, the Koreshan Unity Foundation.

Sincerely,

HUMPHREY & KNOTT, P.A.



Matthew D. Uhle

MDU/dr

cc: Charles Dauray
Greg Stuart
Alan Fields
Paul Schryver

g:\mdu\TEMP\hutch2ltr.

PLANNING DIVISION



LEE COUNTY

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA

MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Noble, AICP, Principal Planner

From: Gloria M. Sajgo, AICP, Principal Planner 

Subject: Comments on the Preliminary Draft of the Estero Community Plan

Date: September 20, 2000

Page 9 the purpose of Table 3 Community Expected Population by 2020 is unclear.

Page 18 the name of the historic document produced by Florida Preservation Services is Lee County Historic Sites Survey

Page 19 and Page 24 With regards to how to protect historic structures and whether to establish a community based architectural standards review board, it is important to consider that Lee County has a historic preservation ordinance that can regulate both historic and non-historic buildings.

Lee County has an active historic preservation program and a very effective historic preservation ordinance. Being designated under the Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 22 of the LDC) would most effectively protect historic structures; changes to historic buildings are reviewed per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Also if an area where designated as a historic district then in addition to reviewing changes to historic buildings, the ordinance would allow for the review of changes to non-historic buildings through the adoption of design guidelines.

This ordinance has been in place for 10 years and has proven record protecting individual historic resources as well as large scale historic districts like Boca Grande and Matlacha. (In both of these districts, historic and non-historic buildings are subject to review.) This ordinance is modeled after the best preservation ordinances in the country and meets the state and federal requirements for Certified Local Governments.

This ordinance is implemented by the Lee County Planning staff and the Lee County Historic Preservation Board, a 7 member board whose members are appointed on the basis their of profession or area of expertise and not on the basis of where they live.

Objective 19.1 is hard to measure since what constitutes a visually attractive community is not identified or defined. The phrase “visually attractive” is too subjective to serve as an effective regulatory standard.

Policy 19.1.1 The phrase “...signage consistent with the Community Vision and architectural standards”...would be hard to implement as the vision statement provides little guidance as to what signage would be appropriate and there are no defined or identified architectural standards.

Policy 19.1.2: A flat prohibition against a deviation is usually too rigid to be applied fairly in the day to day permitting process.

Policy 19.1.3. It is unclear what is meant by “older projects” and what type of incentives these projects would need.

The Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 22 of the LDC) has provisions for zoning relief for designated historic structures that do not meet current zoning regulations. Also the designated historic structures are exempt from FEMA flood regulations and the Building Official has some discretionary latitude so that modern building codes are applied in manner that do not destroy the historic character of a designated resource.

Policy 19.1.4: This policy is similar to 19.6.6. The two could be made to dovetail each other better.

Policy 19.1.5 This policy should reference the Lee County Historic Preservation Ordinance, which is already implemented, rather suggesting that a new concept: a Historic Development Overlay district be implemented.

Objective 19.2 is hard to measure since what constitutes “tasteful shopping and employment opportunities” and the “community character” is not defined. These phrases are too subjective to serve as effective regulatory standards.

Policy 19.2.1 Requiring all commercial development to be reviewed as a commercial planned development might not be practical.

Policy 19.2.3 This policy needs to be more definite. How will non-residential uses be encouraged to be mixed use in nature and allow for residential uses? What are minor commercial uses?

Policy 19.2.4. What specific regulations must be adopted or amended to encourage or “incentivize” mixed use developments along Corkscrew Road.

Policy 19.2.5 How will Lee County discourage retail uses along Three Oaks Parkway in favor of service and residential uses?

Objective 19.3 seems hard to measure, as the phrase “strictly evaluating” is not defined. (The word strictly is too subjective to be an effective regulatory standard.)

Policy 19.3.1. How will higher density residential developments with a mix of unit types be encouraged?

Policy 19.3.3. A good way to protect large lot residential areas is to prohibit the creation of small lots from these larger lots. Is this applicable to this area?

Objective 19.4 What county regulations, policies and discretionary actions must protect or enhance key wetland or native upland habitats? How must they protect or enhance them?

Policy 19.4.2 Lee County takes a countywide approach to land acquisition. It is unrealistic to expect the county to focus its acquisition efforts on the area east of I-75 and along Estero Bay in the absence of a clearly demonstrated immediate need or threat.

Policy 19.4.4. merely states what Lee County is already doing.

Objective 19.5 This public participation objective is a bit unwieldy. Requiring that Lee County *encourage and solicit* public input and participation to and during the *review and adoption* of county regulations, land development code provisions, policies, zoning approvals and *administrative actions* seems unrealistic. A more specific approach identifying the type of notice or participation requirement for each type of government action would be more implementable.

Policy 19.5.1 Development approvals are done by staff without public input.

Policy 19.5.3 What type of issue would trigger a public notice to persons within 500’?

Policy 19.5.3. What does a document clearinghouse mean?

Objective 19.6 It is unclear what level of service for community facilities would be necessary to support a “vibrant urban core”. What is a “vibrant urban core”/

Policy 19.6.3. If historic uses – rather than historic buildings – must be protected, then these uses must be identified.

Policy 19.6.6. This policy should dovetail policy 19.1.4.

S: \historic\estero\estero preliminary draft

Estero looking to the future

8-12-00 pg 1A+
Meeting to focus 9A
on 'sector plan' of
growth guidelines

Bonita Barnes

By **CHAD GILLIS**
Staff Writer

Estero residents will have a chance to help shape local growth and voice their opinions next week on how the community should be developed in the face of mounting development pressures that have caused strained relations between the community and Lee County government.

The meeting is scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, Aug. 15, at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway. It's a joint effort between the Estero Civic Association and the Estero Chamber of Commerce, along with a private planner hired by the community.

The intent of the meeting is to compile a list of concerns and gather opinions about how to best manage future growth. The community plans to eventually add a "sector plan" to the county's land development code that would give Estero its own unique development guidelines and requirements.

EVER

See **ESTERO**, Page **9A**

ESTERO

Continued from 1A

Many residents have expressed a variety of development concerns during past zoning cases and county commissioner meetings. Dissatisfaction with the county dropped to such a low level this year that some Estero residents began to talk about incorporating or merging with Bonita Springs.

Residents now are focusing their attention toward an umbrella-type development plan for the community that would further define what residents want built in Estero and where.

Estero must submit any comprehensive growth plan amendments by Sept. 29 to be considered for adoption during 2001.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a planner with the firm Vanasse & Daylor

in Fort Myers, is in charge of spearheading future development plan amendments for the community. He said drafting amendments by this year's deadline is an ambitious undertaking but added that the community can approach the task in phases, considering more time-sensitive topics immediately.

"Typically these sector plans can take a year to complete and we're trying to do it in basically a month," Hutchcraft said.

Hutchcraft said the overall goal of producing what's known as a "sector plan" for Estero will be approached in three phases. The first leg would consist of comprehensive plan amendments that would add a plan for the Estero community as a goal along with a handful of objectives and policies to be submitted in September.

Next year, he said, Estero will propose land development code amendments that could consist of signage guidelines and modifications to open space stan-

dards. The third portion would include adopting a master development plan for Estero that would direct more intense commercial developments toward certain areas and create residential and preserve areas in other parts of the community.

Hutchcraft said he hopes to compile a list of ideas and opinions at next week's meeting. After that, he'll host a second meeting, tentatively set for Sept. 15, when he will present a more final draft that eventually will find its way to county commissioners.

"We'll have to submit it the following week but we'll have time to tweak it," Hutchcraft said referring to changes made after the second meeting.

He said the first phase will cost around \$6,700, a bill the county agreed to foot for the initial planning effort. The price tag includes the two envisioning workshops, general mapping and a submittal package. A more detailed plan, he guessed, would

cost between \$10,000 and \$12,000.

Meg Venceller, chair of the Estero Civic Association, said she hopes the community can make initial plans for setbacks, buffers, building heights and locate areas designated for commercial or residential development.

"It will give the residents of Estero an opportunity to determine whatever vision they have for Estero," Venceller said. "(But) we're very limited in the first part because of the county's deadline."

Lee Planning Director Paul O'Connor said if Estero meets the Sept. 29 deadline the county could hold Local Planning Agency hearings before Christmas. Such a timeline would bring any comprehensive plan considerations in front of county commissioners sometime in January. After that, the plan would be reviewed by the state before being adopted by the county during the spring of 2001.

Naples Daily
8-16-2000
Page 1B+2B

ESTERO

Residents clash on key growth issues

The community development meeting was the first of two scheduled by private planner Mitch Hutchcraft.

By CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

More than 100 Estero residents gathered Tuesday night to offer their input on how the community can control and plan for growth in the face of mounting development pressures.

The meeting, at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway, was the first of two scheduled by private planner Mitch Hutchcraft. Hutchcraft

was hired by the Estero Civic Association and Estero Chamber of Commerce to help residents draft a community development plan that could be implemented by Lee County commissioners within the next year.

Hutchcraft outlined key issues, such as identifying the community's boundaries and where commercial and residential development should be located, to a crowd with varied and often clashing opinions.

He also said Estero residents could hold public workshops before hearing examiner meetings to offer input to developers wanting to build in the area.

In the past, rezoning cases have disturbed many residents to the point they began considering annexing into Bonita Springs or incorporating.

The latest momentum for the community has been to form a community plan.

Hutchcraft estimated the community plan project would take between 18 and

24 months to complete.

Several residents were thrilled about the idea of forming a unique development plan for a community that is expected to go from about 9,000 residents to 40,000 or more within the next decade.

"This is probably the most exciting thing that's happened since the Koreshans came to town," said Estero resi-

See GROWTH, Page 3B

Growth

Continued from 1D

dent Cas Obie. He added that he thinks residents should work with developers to identify areas targeted for high and low density.

Other residents, feeling Hutchcraft was siding with the development community, pleaded with the planner to come up with more effective means of dealing with county government.

"I think they're tired of being subjected to 4½ blind men,"

said Norm Lukes, referring to the half as Lee County Commissioner Ray Judah, who is often the lone dissenting voice during controversial rezoning cases. "... When do the citizens really get to input?"

Lukes said Estero is a community with its own mind and that it needs no direction from government officials in Fort Myers.

Still other residents disagreed on where to put commercial developments.

Those who live along Three Oaks Parkway said Corkscrew Road should be a commercial corridor, while residents on Corkscrew said high-density development should go on Three Oaks.

Some residents said a moratorium is the only way to effectively slow growth enough to get a handle on the community.

Hutchcraft responded to many of the disagreements by saying residents, as well as local developers, need to work together if a community plan is going to get the thumbs-up from Lee County commissioners.

Next on Hutchcraft's agenda is to submit a draft of the community plan to the Local Planning Agency near the end of the month. After that a second public meeting will be held for further input in mid-September before the plan is submitted to the county on or before Sept. 29.

meet tonight on Estero development proposal

The plan will be an attempt to marry the desires of residents with those in the business community.

Naples Daily 8-15-77
By CHARLIE WHITEHEAD
Staff Writer *pg 1A+ 3D*

The future begins tonight for the community of Estero.

With an eye toward seizing control of the community's future, residents will gather at South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway to begin fashioning a communitywide development plan. The plan will be an attempt to marry the desires of residents with those in the business community, allowing for the future growth of the community while protecting the residents' vision.

That is vital if the plan is to go further than the planning stage, according to Lee County Planning Director Paul O'Connor. If the community expects Lee County commissioners to approve sweeping changes in the growth management plan, the community plan will have to be one supported by more than just one group of residents or businesses.

"If the planning effort is to be successful, it has to be very broad-based," O'Connor said. "It will have to be somewhat embraced by the entire community."

O'Connor said he has encouraged the various groups that have jointly launched the effort to make a concerted effort to include every portion of the community, from the most ambitious developer to the most strident preservationist. Otherwise, he said, commissioners aren't likely to make changes that dramatically affect the area's future.

See ESTERO, Page 3D

Estero

Continued from 1D

Eileen Galvin, executive director of the Estero Chamber of Commerce, said tonight's meeting is likely to help residents of the community better understand the way the plan will be developed.

"Most of the people are not knowledgeable about how the county works, but it's up to the residents of Estero to put their input into it," Galvin said.

The community has hired local professional planner Mitch Hutchcraft to draft proposed growth plan changes specific to Estero. The county has also stepped up with funding. Commissioners agreed last week to provide as much as \$25,000 in matching funds for so-called sector plans.

O'Connor, however, prefers "community plans."

"I want to call them community plans," he said. "People want a better sense of community. People don't live in a sector. They live in a community."

In Estero, the planning effort will take place in two phases. To amend the growth plan this year, changes must be proposed by the end of September. O'Connor said the community should address the issues it considers most pressing, with an eye toward presenting another round of changes next year.

"Ideally, when you do a community plan, it would take eight to 14 months. The community felt that waiting a year was not going to work," he said.

Galvin said she was pleased Estero residents would help decide how the community will evolve in the future. "The best way is to let all the people have a voice in it," she said.

Tonight's meeting is set for 6:30.

A little fear can sometimes go a long way

Fear sometimes gets a bad rap.

Nobody wants to be called a scaredy-cat, we're never supposed to let anyone see fear make us sweat, and there's the residual effect of that old adage about fear from John F. Kennedy.

A little fear can sometimes be a good thing, though, as Estero residents have been finding out lately.

Estero was the beneficiary earlier this week of a wise move by the Lee County Commission to give residents unprecedented influence over how their community is developed. The county agreed to let the residents come up with a "sector plan," a 50-cent term for a simple concept:

treating a certain area differently than everything else around it.

The county not only agreed to let Estero residents participate in such a plan, commissioners agreed to help fund it, voting unanimously to cough up \$6,700. You read that right: County commissioners voted to spend money to pay for something that might put a crimp in the current "There's no such thing as bad development" philosophy.

Why? Good old fear, that's why.

Estero residents have been loudly unhappy in recent months with the county's planning process, or lack of a planning process. They rallied to stop a proposed auto dealership on U.S. 41, they packed commission chambers to

protest "bubble plans" that give developers virtual carte blanche to build whatever they want. They wrote letters, they created activist groups, they made lots of noise about the possibility of incorporation.

In short, they scared county commissioners.

There is little scarier to the county, already reeling from the incorporation of Bonita Springs, than the possibility of losing another hunk of tax base, especially one that just so happens to be the fastest growing area in Southwest Florida.

This week's unanimous vote to fund the sector planning process was the direct result of that fear. Such

planning isn't restricted to Estero, but Estero will be the first to embrace it.

The initial meeting to gather input for the plan is at 6:30 p.m. this Tuesday, Aug. 15, at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway. That's not an awful lot of notice, but Estero doesn't have much time to play with: the community needs to have at least the first phase of such a plan done by Sept. 29.

The logistics of enacting such a plan are tortuous, but the goal isn't. At its simplest, a sector plan is designed to define a certain area and come up with development regulations tailored specifically to that area. Residents and planners would take a look at the entire community, see where the best

places would be for commercial development, for houses and condos, for parks and green space.

Such a process is a good idea for many reasons, not the least of which is that it recognizes that Estero isn't the same thing as Cape Coral or Lehigh Acres or North Fort Myers. A sector plan also could be an important step toward a new philosophy in growth management in which growth actually is planned for rather than reacted to.

If Estero does it right, maybe the rest of the county will realize you can take a big-picture approach to growth and manage it rather than letting it manage you.

That's not such a scary thought.

TODD PRATT

Estero residents get glimpse of community plan

By MARK S. KRZOS
The News-Press

ESTERO — Estero residents finally got a glimpse of the layer of protection they hope will stop developments they feel do not belong in their community.

More than 150 residents came to hear what their community plan will entail Tuesday night at the Corkscrew Woodlands Clubhouse.

A community plan is a way for residents to determine what their community will look like in the future. In Estero residents have been upset with recent development approvals such as a proposed Sam Galloway car dealership and the county's use of "bubble plans" that allow a wide variety of commercial uses.

Mitch Hutchcraft, the consultant hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to craft the community's vision, said the plan's preliminary draft incorporated the responses of more than 150 questionnaires handed out to Estero residents.

Hutchcraft said the first task in developing the plan was writing a vision statement for Estero. The statement calls for embracing Estero's historic heritage, carefully planning for future growth as a village and establishing defined areas for tasteful shopping, service and entertainment.

Hutchcraft said once Estero's vision statement was developed, key community issues became the focus of the plan. They were:

- Community character — proactively address appearance, landscaping, signage and the location and type of certain

land uses.

- Residential land uses — maintain a "small town" feel and avoid high-rise residential uses while protecting existing neighborhoods from encroachment.

- Commercial land uses — limit tourist-oriented uses, detrimental uses such as adult entertainment, free-standing bars and liquor stores, and limit high intensity uses along specific corridors.

- Natural resources — protect groundwater resources and wetlands.

- Public participation — become more involved in the development approval process.

Hutchcraft also said beginning today, a draft of the plan will be available for all Estero residents to read through at the South County Regional Library on Three Oaks Parkway.

Most residents attending the meeting were pleased with what they heard.

"I don't think we need a city status to achieve the goals everyone is talking about," said resident Jan Schneider.

Resident Doyle Moeller, 55, said he thinks the community plan will allow residents to keep Estero the way it is.

"It's a nice, clean community and I'd like to see it stay that way," Moeller said. "That the reason I moved here."

The recommendations and plan will be submitted to the county Sept. 29 for inclusion in the Lee Plan's amendment cycle.

— Contact Mark S. Krzos at mkrzos@news-press.com or 992-1345.

Residents' concerns outlined in draft of community plan

BY CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

The rapid-fire path to a community plan for Estero climaxed Tuesday night with the unveiling of a draft plan before more than 100 people who turned out for a final meeting to offer their input.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a private planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead a community plan, presented his draft, which he must submit to Lee County officials by Sept. 29 if

it is to be voted on by county commissioners next year.

The meeting was the second of the summer conducted by Hutchcraft. An initial community plan meeting held in August drew 125 people.

Hutchcraft outlined the main concerns residents expressed at the previous meeting and through questionnaires distributed in August.

The top issue was protecting

See ESTERO, Page 14A

Estero

Continued from 1A

groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

Hutchcraft said of the more than 120 questionnaires that were returned in time for the draft, residents who wanted to see at least some commercial development said they'd prefer small shops over strip malls.

The general consensus of the community also, according to the returned questionnaires, centered around prohibiting commercial uses such as car lots and bars.

Overall, Hutchcraft said, Estero residents want to be able to influence a community many think has had little successful guidance in the past.

"There seems to be an impression that the community has just leap-frogged with no planned direction," Hutchcraft said.

An objective highlighted in Hutchcraft's presentation was increased public participation in county government.

He included a handful of policies in the first phase of the community plan aimed at integrating residents with the development approval process. The policy included mandating that the county notify groups within Estero of pending ordinance reviews, development code amendments or development approvals.

It also suggests the county establish a document clearinghouse in Estero where copies of planning staff and hearing examiner reports would be available for public inspection.

Prior to the meeting, participants received a summary of Hutchcraft's initial community plan draft that highlighted several sections in the plan, including preserving the historical facets of the community and protecting existing residential areas from intense commercial uses. His outline included defining the Estero community as a goal within the Lee Plan, which is a comprehensive blueprint for the entire county.

After Hutchcraft's presentation, several residents asked him how the community could best preserve resources such as the area's future drinking water supply.

Ellen Peterson, a local environmentalist, gave a bleak fore-

cast for the community's main water bodies.

"I think you're sort of being a little over optimistic to think you're going to protect the Estero River," Peterson said.

Peterson said the community should be concerned about water retention, adding that communities near the river send their overflow down the river and into the bay.

"The wells are going dry and they're going dry because the water doesn't get a chance to percolate down," she said.

Arnold Rosenthal told Hutchcraft during the meeting that he'd like to see more emphasis placed on parking lot setbacks and requirements. He said he was satisfied with Hutchcraft's work to this point.

"It's a good first draft given the time that he had," Rosenthal said. "I think we're on the right track."

If the Sept. 29 deadline is met, the county could hold Local Planning Agency hearings before Christmas. Such a timeline would bring any comprehensive plan considerations in front of county commissioners sometime in January.

After that, the plan would be reviewed by the state before a final vote by commissioners in spring 2001.

Residents offered 2nd look at plan for Estero

Naples Daily News
9-16-00
Pg 1A & 11A

By CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

Estero residents will get one last shot to give their input on how to best plan for the community's future during a 6:30 p.m. meeting at Corkscrew Woodlands on Tuesday, Sept. 19.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a private planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead Estero's community plan, said he will present a draft of the first submittal of the community plan. The plan must be given to the county by Sept. 29 if county commissioners are to vote on adopting the development code language next spring.

Tuesday's meeting is the second of two involving Hutchcraft. The first took place at the South Lee County Regional Library last month with about 125 residents attending. The meeting was moved to Corkscrew Woodlands to accommodate more attendees. The community's clubhouse has a capacity of 300.

"We'll probably have some handouts of an executive summary of the actual Lee plan presentation," Hutchcraft said. "We'll also identify recommendations for the phase two and phase three of the plan."

Hutchcraft said he met Thursday with the Estero Community Plan Committee, which consists of six community representatives, including chamber and civic association members and developers, to discuss his current draft and any changes that need to be made to the summary before Tuesday's meeting.

After the meeting, Hutchcraft will have until Sept. 29 to submit the plan to the county if it is to be considered during the next fiscal year. Estero residents are trying to make changes to the county's development code so that there are development regulations specific to the fast-growing Estero area.

He said he's continually more optimistic about the first phase of the community plan, adding that several main issues, such as guiding development with an overall aesthetic blueprint, have surfaced from the residents who have given input so far.

ESTERO

Continued from 1A

"I think everybody will be pleased (with the draft and the eventual community plan submittal)," he said. "It seems like there's a core consensus on a lot of issues."

Hutchcraft said he will post copies of the 40-page draft in the

library for residents to review after the meeting.

Chamber director Eileen Galvin said Estero residents who plan to attend the Tuesday meeting should come ready to share their ideas on how the community can best manage growth.

"They need to come with their thoughts if they haven't already

put them out there," Galvin said. "And hopefully they'll be constructive."

Galvin said forming a consensus of community concerns is the main objective of the information gathering meetings.

"You have to hope that you're getting a sample of the feelings of the majority of people," Galvin said.

Bonita Banner 9.23.00 pg 3c

Estero residents coming together on changes to development code

By CHAD GILLIS
Staff Writer

The rapid-fire path to a community plan for Estero climaxed Tuesday night with the unveiling of a draft plan before more than 100 people who turned out for a final meeting to offer their input.

Mitch Hutchcraft, a private planner hired by the Estero Chamber of Commerce to spearhead a community plan, presented his draft, which he must submit to Lee County officials by Sept. 29 if it is to be voted on by county commissioners next year.

The meeting was the second of the summer conducted by Hutchcraft. An initial community plan meeting held in August drew 125 people.

Hutchcraft outlined the main concerns residents expressed at the previous meeting and through questionnaires distributed in August.

The top issue was protecting groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

Hutchcraft said of the more than 120 questionnaires that were returned in time for the draft, residents who wanted to see at least some commercial development said they'd prefer small shops over strip malls.

The general consensus of the community also, according to the returned questionnaires, centered around prohibiting commercial uses such as car lots and bars.

Overall, Hutchcraft said, Estero residents want to be able to influence a community many think has had little successful guidance in the past.

"There seems to be an impression that the community has just leap-frogged with no planned direction," Hutchcraft said.

An objective highlighted in Hutchcraft's presentation was increased public participation in county government.

He included a handful of policies in the first phase of the community plan aimed at integrating residents with the development approval process. The policy included mandating that the county notify groups within Estero of pending ordinance reviews, development code amendments or development approvals.

It also suggests the county establish a document clearing-

The top issue was protecting groundwater supplies and natural resources. Estero's aesthetic appearance was second, followed by controlling community development and maintaining a small-town atmosphere.

house in Estero where copies of planning staff and hearing examiner reports would be available for public inspection.

Prior to the meeting, participants received a summary of Hutchcraft's initial community plan draft that highlighted several sections in the plan, including preserving the historical facets of the community and protecting existing residential areas from intense commercial uses. His outline included defining the Estero community as a goal within the Lee Plan, which is a comprehensive blueprint

for the entire county.

After Hutchcraft's presentation, several residents asked him how the community could best preserve resources such as the area's future drinking water supply.

Ellen Peterson, a local environmentalist, gave a bleak forecast for the community's main water bodies.

"I think you're sort of being a little over optimistic to think you're going to protect the Estero River," Peterson said.

Peterson said the community should be concerned about wa-

ter retention, adding that communities near the river send their overflow down the river and into the bay.

"The wells are going dry and they're going dry because the water doesn't get a chance to percolate down," she said.

Arnold Rosenthal told Hutchcraft during the meeting that he'd like to see more emphasis placed on parking lot setbacks and requirements. He said he was satisfied with Hutchcraft's work to this point.

"It's a good first draft given the time that he had," Rosenthal said. "I think we're on the right track."

If the Sept. 29 deadline is met, the county could hold Local Planning Agency hearings before Christmas. Such a timeline would bring any comprehensive plan considerations in front of county commissioners sometime in January.

After that, the plan would be reviewed by the state before a final vote by commissioners in spring 2001.

Paul D. To: Matt

Site sections

Front page | Classified | GoShopBonita

BONITA NEWS.COM

Bonita | Bonita Banner

✉ 📄 🔍 [Bonita front](#) | [Bonita archive](#) | [help](#)

Save Estero looks to its future goals

Saturday, June 16, 2001

By CHAD GILLIS, Staff Writer

Still feeling the aftermath from the incorporation of Bonita Springs, a new civic group has formed in Estero recently with the goal of protecting the community's borders and historical integrity.

Called Save Estero, the group will focus on helping educate Estero residents on the future options for this community of about 10,000.

One of the group's primary concerns is is the potential annexation of parts or all of Estero by Bonita Springs. Come Jan. 1, 2005, a 5-year annexation moratorium prohibiting Bonita Springs from annexing within Estero's borders will end.

Save Estero members are concerned that the community will lose valuable areas like The Brooks, the Hyatt Regency Coconut Point — the county's only five-star resort — and maybe even a proposed Simon Suncoast mall along U.S. 41.

Bonita Spring would stand to gain a significant tax base if the city annexed parts or all of Estero.

The group recently incorporated as a not-for-profit organization and all officers filed financial disclosure forms with Lee County, said Larry Newell, Save Estero president. He said the group does not plan to request funding assistance from the county.


Board chair Bill Brown said although there's no hard feelings between the Estero community and Bonita Springs, the group is preparing to combat any annexation efforts by Bonita Springs.

"We felt there needs to be a group out there that says Estero does not welcome annexation by Bonita Springs," Brown said. "You've got to look at annexation by Bonita Springs, not just incorporation."

Brown said without some added layer of protection, such as cityhood, Bonita Springs could stake its claim on some of the most valuable areas of Estero.

He said the group hopes to help educate the community in the coming months as to the options for Estero. The community could stay an

GO
SHOP BONITA
 Shop for a home, a car, a job, a place to eat, a gift and more!



Find:

N

WCI Realty

unincorporated area of Lee County, become a city or be annexed in part or whole by Bonita Springs.

Brown said if the community becomes united in an incorporation push, Save Estero would be willing to lead the charge.

He said Save Estero would be willing to raise the \$30,000 to \$50,000 needed to pay a certified planner to perform a feasibility study. The studies are used to determine whether or not cityhood would be a viable option for hopeful communities.

Newell agreed.



"Save Estero would take the reigns if the community supported the feasibility study," Newell said.

Brown said if Estero residents decide in the coming months that a feasibility study would be a wise choice, Save Estero would hope to have the study finalized by May of 2002 or May of 2003 at the latest.

Both Brown and Newell stressed that Save Estero is neutral about the future government options for Estero. The idea behind the effort is to help guide the community through whatever action its residents deems necessary.

In recent weeks, the Estero Civic Association's board of directors voted to not support incorporation, although no group in the community has promoted cityhood to date.

Civic association representatives could not be reached for comment Friday.



Estero Chamber of Commerce executive director Eileen Galvin said she is neutral at this point, preferring not to make a decision on anything until more information is available to the community.

"We need to get more information and sit and watch," Galvin said. "As it unfolds, it will be interesting to see how things go."

Galvin said Estero is in an ideal situation because the community can watch the City of Bonita Springs as a close point of reference.

She said Estero's community plan, which is scheduled to go before the county's Local Planning Agency later this month, should provide a good "backbone" for the community regardless of what route Estero residents decide to take in the future.



Chad Gillis can be reached at 213-6040 or by e-mail at cegillis@naplesnews.com.

 [E-mail this story to a friend.](#)

 [Format this story for printing.](#)

 [Search our archive for related stories:](#)

[advanced search](#)

Navigation:

[Go to today's Bonita section front](#)

[Go to our 7-day Bonita archive](#)



Also in today's Bonita section:

[Deputies to ticket roadside cars, vendors](#)
[Drug fighters organize opposition to statewide treatment proposal](#)
[Edison, FGCU deal gives students bachelor's degree option](#)
[Event's aim: 'Stamp Out' sexual violence](#)
[FGCU student to work at NASA over summer](#)
[Fire officials warn of obscured addresses](#)
[House members want more money to run offices](#)
[Kay Smith: Sanibel refuge to hold duck stamp event](#)
[Lightning strikes ignite local brushfires](#)
[Mike Peltier: Gov. Bush grabs national, international spotlight](#)
[Personal fireworks ban often ignored](#)

Also in today's Bonita Banner:

['Tis True: An alarming morning experience at a drug store in Ohio](#)

[Anniversaries](#)

[Arrest Blotter](#)

[Banner Almanac: A time to honor all fathers, dads and papas](#)

[Beach Park may get playground](#)

[Briefly](#)

[Building Permits](#)

[Business Briefs](#)

[Chocolate delight: Desserts auctioned off to raise money for Project HELP](#)

[Church Briefs](#)

[Churches](#)

[Dr. Charles Lewis: Keeping the faith, walking with Christ](#)

[Lee principals forced to cut jobs](#)

[Letter of the Day: I'm still awfully glad to be a dad](#)

[Letters to the Editor: Public Forum](#)

[Obituaries](#)

FREE EMAIL
SIGN-UP FOR
YourName@naplesnews.net

wink
NEWS

access
AMERICA'S GUIDE
TO THE INTERNET

Postcards:

Send an electronic postcard to somebody you know.

Coupons:

Save at local area businesses. 

Ad Rates:

For Naples Daily News and naplesnews.com

BillPay

Managing your advertising account payments

Subscribe:

Get the print edition of the Daily News delivered to your door.

Policy 19.2.5: The Estero Community will propose regulations for to review, amend or adopt that prohibits "Detrimental uses" (as defined in the Land Development Code), free-standing nightclubs, or bar and cocktail lounges, and retail uses that ^{have} require outdoor display in excess of one acre are prohibited in the Estero Planning Community, and storage or delivery areas from locating within 500' of an existing or approved residential neighborhood.

Objective 19.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. Lee County shall will encourage and solicit public input and participation prior to and during the review and adoption of county regulations, land development code provisions, Lee Plan provisions policies, and zoning approvals, and development orders.

agenda?

Policy 19.5.1: Lee County shall will register groups within the Estero Community that desire notification of pending review of ordinances, Land Development Code amendments and Lee Plan amendments or development approvals. Upon registration, Lee County will provide registered groups with documentation regarding these pending amendments. Lee County will send written notifications summarizing the issue being reviewed and any established hearing dates. This notice is a courtesy only and is not jurisdictional. Accordingly, the county's failure to mail or to timely mail such notice, or failure of any affected property owner to receive mailed notice, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar the public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

As a courtesy,

Citizen groups
-homeowners associations
-condo association

Policy 19.5.2: Lee County shall ~~The Estero Community~~ will establish a "document clearing house" in the Estero Community, where copies of ^{zoning} selected ~~submittal~~ documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations or and resolutions will be provided for public inspection, as soon as they are available.

Policy 19.5.3: The owner or agent for any Planned Development request within the Estero Community, in coordination with zoning staff, shall must conduct one public workshop within two weeks of the project being found sufficient. Lee County encourages zoning staff to participate in such public workshops.

forum?
informational session?

one month after submitted

informational

14. Are there any other issues that you think ought to be addressed?
as we proceed with the Estero Community Plan?

15. What issues do you feel are important relative to past growth?

16. What issues do you feel are important relative to future growth?

17. Are there any other recommendations on land use that you
want to offer?

18. Please identify any problems or opportunities with specific
natural resources that you would like addressed.

Facilities and Services

19. Please rank the following public facilities and services based
on your perception of the relative need for improvement.

| Rank Importance (1 most to 14 least) | Facility/Service | Comment |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|
| | Roads | |
| | Bike Paths | |
| | Water Supply | |
| | Drainage | |
| | Solid Waste | |
| | Parks and Recreation | |
| | Fire Protection | |
| | Library | |
| | Education | |
| | Culture | |
| | Religion | |
| | Law Enforcement | |
| | Health Care | |

Estero Community Plan

Public Workshop #1 Questionnaire

August 15, 2000

Vanasse & Daylor is working in cooperation with the **Estero Chamber of Commerce**, the **Estero Concerned Citizens Association**, the **Estero Civic Association**, and the **Residents of Estero** to develop a Community Plan for the Estero Community. The Community Plan will address issues relating to land use, public facilities and services, natural resources and housing. This questionnaire is intended to gather an initial indication of the interests and priorities of the residents of the Estero Community.

Please complete the questionnaire and mail it to Vanasse & Daylor, LLP at the address listed below, or drop it by the Estero Chamber of Commerce, by August 23, 2000.

Mail the questionnaire to:
Diane Wakeman, Administrative Coordinator
Vanasse & Daylor, LLP
12730 New Brittany Boulevard, Suite 600
Fort Myers, FL 33907
(941) 437-4601



General

1. What general area do you consider to be your neighborhood?

2. What do you envision Estero to look like in 2010? What character do you want it to have?

3. Given the current year-round population of approximately 5,000, how big do you see the Estero Community in 20 years?

Character

4. Would you support changes to the existing signage regulation? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

5. Would you support changes to the landscaping regulations? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

6. Would you support changes to architectural requirements? (Please check) Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

Land Use - Residential

7. Are there areas of the Estero community that you think should be identified for higher density uses?

8. Are there areas that of the Estero community that you think should be identified for lower density uses?

Land Use - Commercial

9. Are there areas of the Estero community that you think should be identified for higher intensity uses?

10. Are there areas that of the Estero community that you think should be identified for lower intensity uses?

11. Are there any specific commercial uses you would like to encourage or discourage within the Community?

Other

12. What, if anything, would you like to see changed in the Estero community?

13. Have you ever participated in a public hearing or zoning process? Yes _____ No _____ Would you recommend any changes?

1500 W Monroe - Meeting - Oct 30th 2000

| | Sign in sheet | Phone |
|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Eddie Perri | E. Perri | 495-8090 |
| Mary Ignarella | E. Chamber | 947-6365 |
| GLORIA SAJOO | Lee Co. Planning | 479-8311 |
| Rick Burris | Lee Co. Planning | 479-8526 |
| Brandy Ambrose | Lee Co. Planning | 479-8316 |
| Matt Noble |) | 479-8546 |
| NEAL NOETHLICH | ESTERO PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE | 495-6698 |
| DON ESLICK | " " " " | 949-4050 |
| MITCH HUTCHCRAFT | VANASSA DAVIS | 437-4641 |

Matt:

Comments on
the Estero Plan


by Quentin Quesnell

4163 Pensacola Ave

Estero FL 33928

941-948-4223

Clare




Legend


- Water
- Major Roads
- Roads
- Estero Planning Community

Estero Planning Community

Plan Amendment CPA 2000-00019







Legend

- Water
- Major Roads
- Roads
- Estero Planning Community

Estero Planning Community

Plan Amendment CPA 2000-00019



7,000 3,500 0 7,000 Feet

