

**MINUTES REPORT  
LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(LDCAC)  
Friday, January 10, 2025  
8:30 a.m.**

**Committee Members Present:**

Jem Frantz	Al Quattrone
Randy Krise, Vice Chair	Jennifer Sopen
Jarod Prentice	Christopher Scott

**Excused / Absent:**

Jay Johnson	Bill Prys
Tom Lehnert	Amy Thibaut, Chair
Veronica Martin	Patrick Vanasse
Jack Morris	

**Lee County Government Staff Present:**

Joe Adams, Asst, County Atty.	Janet Miller, DCD Admin.
Sandra David, DCD Admin.	Anthony Rodriguez, Zoning Manager
Brandon Dunn, Planning Manager	Katie Woellner, Planning
Lindsay Hickey, DCD Admin.	

**AGENDA ITEM 1 - CALL TO ORDER/REVIEW OF AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION**

Mr. Krise, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Large First Floor CR 1B, Community Development/Public Works Building, 1500 Monroe Street, Fort Myers, Florida.

Mr. Joe Adams, Assistant County Attorney, reviewed the Affidavit of Publication and found it legally sufficient as to form and content.

**AGENDA ITEM 2 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 13, 2024**

**Mr. Scott made a motion to approve the December 13, 2024 minutes, seconded by Ms. Sopen. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

**AGENDA ITEM 4 – LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS**

**A. Food Truck Parks**

Ms. Woellner provided an overview of the revisions to this section that were requested during the December 13, 2024 Land Development Code Advisory Committee meeting. She also referred to Section 34-3181 (b) which was supposed to be changed to be just “*special exception*” instead of also including “*planned development*.” Ms. Woellner noted that staff is amenable to that change.

Mr. Krise referred to Section 34-1264 on the bottom of Page 3 and asked for clarification that this change would not preclude schools or day care centers from having a food truck come to their facility as a fundraiser.

Ms. Woellner stated that was correct. It would not preclude something like that.

Mr. Krise asked for confirmation that this change was due to the alcohol and seating components for food truck parks.

Ms. Woellner stated that was correct.

Mr. Quattrone asked about the 10 spaces per conveyance pad because he was not at the December meeting when this was discussed. He asked for clarification that if you have a standalone park that has 6 trucks, they would be required to have 60 parking spaces.

Ms. Woellner stated that was correct.

Mr. Quattrone asked if the 10 spaces per conveyance pad was based on some type of reference that has deemed the number of spaces needed. To him, it seemed to be a lot of parking spaces per truck.

Ms. Woellner explained that staff looked at local examples, such as Backyard Social, as well as examples from Collier County, surrounding counties, and some other places within the state. The data showed that in urban areas a lot of the food truck parks had minimal parking such as a total of 12 spaces for 4 or 5 trucks. However, there were also instances such as Backyard Social where they are parking at essentially 12 or 14 spaces per conveyance but need additional parking. She explained that the intent was to create a reasonable minimal requirement with some alleviation within areas that are slightly more urban. For instance, in mixed use overlays or multi-use developments, there are parking reductions allowed.

Mr. Quattrone felt that Backyard Social was more of a bar/hang-out atmosphere. However, he has a client working on a food truck park in Lehigh where he wants to have 4 or 5 trucks. His client's intent is to have his food truck park be more of a lunch or dinner crowd, but it would not be elevated to the extent of a Backyard Social type project, so he felt this amendment might affect someone like his client.

Mr. Dunn stated staff would review Note 16 further. He noted that this amendment is not merely identifying the parking. It also helps the county focus food truck parks where they want them to be located by allowing for the reduced parking in the urban areas. He noted that Lehigh would most likely be able to take advantage of something like this.

Mr. Scott asked if Lee County has other ways to request parking deviations besides this amendment in unique situations where a food truck might not require as much. In an instance such as that, he asked if they could request a reduction by some other means.

Ms. Woellner stated there were some administrative deviations allowed in the code.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that the code allows up to a 10% administrative parking reduction subject to certain criteria which includes being on a walkways or bikeways map as designated in the Lee Plan, proximity to transit stops, providing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and other things of that nature.

Mr. Scott asked for clarification that if someone wanted to go above an administrative deviation, they would have to go through a full variance process.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that was correct.

Mr. Quattrone referred to Number 5 under Section 34-3182. Requirements on Page 5 of 6 where it states, *“Internal circulation providing conveyances access to the conveyance pad(s). In no instance shall a conveyance traverse a required buffer or landscaped area to access the conveyance pad.”* He asked for clarification of this section.

Mr. Rodriguez stated the word “conveyance” is a defined term. “Conveyance” is the truck itself. He explained that the intent is to require the conveyance to have a designated path to get to the pad from whatever internal access.....

Mr. Quattrone referred to a food truck park on Lehigh Boulevard that is not permitted. It is located close to Gunnery Road. When he researched it to see what type of development order they obtained, he discovered they did not have a development order. Despite the fact that they are in violation, he asked how the park was functioning with its parking.

Mr. Rodriguez stated the county would treat it as a commercial development that will be subject to commercial design standards. He explained that if there are permanent structures, there will be architectural standards that must be met. They will be required to provide commercial buffers, commercial open space, etc. Mr. Rodriguez also noted that if today’s Food Truck amendments go through the process and ultimately get adopted, there will be a lot of *“hand holding”* on staff’s side just to get these parks that are operating without the appropriate permits to get into compliance. It is something that will take time and there will need to be an educational effort to help shepherd these parks through the process if they want to continue to operate as they have been.

Mr. Quattrone stated he did have a concern with these trucks parked along the road. He did not feel that a 15 foot right-of-way buffer does much to make the project look nice.

Ms. Woellner stated that the regulations also require the paved conveyance pads to meet the setback requirements. They will not only need to meet the setbacks, but they will have to be separated by the 10 feet or the fire separation requirement.

Mr. Quattrone stated there is only a requirement for a 30% canopy, which generally cannot meet architectural standards.

Mr. Rodriguez stated they would need to be permanent structures and will need to meet commercial building requirements, etc., so there will be some minimal standards that will be applied.

Mr. Quattrone stated he believed the definition of a building is more than 50% walls. If someone puts in a completely open-air canopy with a roof structure, then he did not believe it would fall within the definition of a building and would not meet commercial building design requirements.

Mr. Dunn stated that staff would review that further.

Ms. Woellner also noted they would be required to provide permanent sanitary facilities such as a bathroom and something else as well. The structure would have to meet the commercial design standards.

**Mr. Scott made a motion to find the Food Truck Park amendments to be consistent with the Lee Plan, but that this motion included the removal of the reference to “planned development” in section 34-3181 (b), which was mentioned by Ms. Woellner during her presentation, seconded by Ms. Frantz. The motion was called and passed 6-0.**

**AGENDA ITEM 5 – ADJOURNMENT/NEXT MEETING DATE**

There was no further discussion. Mr. Krise adjourned the meeting at 8:45 a.m.