



LEE COUNTY

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

kwiktag®

022 564 753



Writer's Direct Dial Number: (941) 479-8309

Bob Janes
District One

November 5, 2003

Douglas R. St. Cerny
District Two

Ray Judah
District Three

Andrew W. Coy
District Four

John E. Albion
District Five

Donald D. Stilwell
County Manager

James G. Yaeger
County Attorney

Diana M. Parker
County Hearing
Examiner

Ray Eubank, Administrator
Florida Department of Community Affairs
Division of Community Planning
Bureau of Local Planning
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL. 32399-2100

Re: Amendments to the Lee Plan
Adoption Submission Package (DCA No. 03-2) for the 2002/2003 Regular Comprehensive Plan
Amendment Cycle

Dear Mr. Eubank:

In accordance with the provisions of F.S. Chapter 163.3184 and of 9J-11.011, this submission package constitutes the adopted 2002/2003 Regular Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle to the Lee Plan (DCA No. 03-2), known locally as CPA 2002-02, CPA 2002-04, CPA 2002-06, CPA 2002-08, CPA 2002-11, CPA 2002-13, CPA 2002-15, CPA 2002-19, and CPA 2002-22. The adoption hearing for these plan amendments was held at 9:30 am on October 23, 2003.

Included with this package, per 9J-11.011(5), are three copies of the adopted amendments, supporting data and analysis, and the following three adopting ordinances: Ordinance No. 03-19, Ordinance No. 03-20, and Ordinance No. 03-21. Also included, per F.S. 163.3184(7) and (15), is the required sign in form allowing a courtesy informational statement to interested citizens. By copy of this letter and its attachments I certify that this amendment has been sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Department of Environmental Protection, the Florida Department of State, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Division of Forestry, and the South Florida Water Management District.

The initial staff reports for the proposed amendments were sent to the DCA with a transmittal cover letter dated July 3, 2003. All amendments previously reviewed by the Department in this current cycle of amendments were adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. Changes have occurred in CPA 2002-02, CPA 2002-13, and CPA 2002-19. CPA 2002-02 has been revised to address the objections raised by the DCA. Staff and the applicant have negotiated a compromise that has resulted in additional text changes. Revisions to CPA 2002-13 were also made. At the time that the transmittal staff report was prepared, it was noted that additional amendments to the MPO's highway map were being considered. The MPO has in fact adopted a revised plan in a public hearing process on June 20, 2003 and staff is reflecting the most recent version of the MPO's plan in Maps 3A, 3B and 3H, and in Policy 21.1.1. CPA 2002-19 has replaced a new table reflecting the new 2004/2008 fiscal year to the CIP. The Board of County Commissioners adopted 2002-02, CPA 2002-13, and CPA 2002-19 with the noted changes.

If you have any questions, or if I can be of any assistance in this matter, please feel free to call me at the above telephone number.

Sincerely,
DEPT. OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Division of Planning



Paul O'Connor, AICP
Director

All documents and reports attendant to this adoption are also being sent, by copy of this cover, to:

David Burr
Interim Director
Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council

Mike Rippe, District Director
FDOT District One

Executive Director
South Florida Water Management District

Plan Review Section
Department of Environmental Protection

Florida Department of State

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

The Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Division of Forestry

LEE COUNTY ORDINANCE NO. 03-19
(Consent Ordinance)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN, COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE "LEE PLAN" ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 89-02, AS AMENDED, SO AS TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA DURING THE COUNTY'S 2002/2003 REGULAR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CYCLE; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENTS TO ADOPTED TEXT, MAPS AND TABLES; PURPOSE AND SHORT TITLE; LEGAL EFFECT; GEOGRAPHICAL APPLICABILITY; 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 amendments to the Plan in compliance with State statutes and in accordance with administrative procedures adopted by the Board of County Commissioners; 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 provide an opportunity for the public to participate in the plan amendment public hearing process; and,

WHEREAS, the Lee County Local Planning Agency ("LPA") held public hearings pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, and the Lee County Administrative Code on January 27, March 24, April 28, and May 28, 2003; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners, pursuant to Florida Statutes and the Lee County Administrative Code held a public hearing for the transmittal of the proposed amendments on June 25, 2003. At that hearing, the Board approved a motion to send, and did later send, the proposed amendment to the Florida Department of Community Affairs ("DCA") for review and comment; and,

WHEREAS, at the transmittal hearing on June 25, 2003, the Board announced its intention to hold a public hearing after the receipt of DCA's written comments commonly referred to as the "ORC Report." DCA issued their ORC report on September 5, 2003; and,

WHEREAS, the Board moved to adopt the proposed amendments to the Lee Plan set forth herein during its statutorily prescribed public hearing for the plan amendments on October 23, 2003.

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, conducted a series of public hearings to consider proposed amendments to the Lee Plan. The purpose of this ordinance is to adopt the certain amendments to the Lee Plan discussed at those meetings and approved by a majority of the Board. The short title and proper reference for the Lee County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, as amended, will continued to be the "Lee Plan." **This ordinance may be referred to as the "2002/2003 Regular Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle Consent Ordinance."**

SECTION TWO: ADOPTION OF LEE COUNTY'S 2002/2003 REGULAR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CYCLE (Consent Agenda Items)

The Lee County Board of County Commissioners 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 October 23, 2003, known as: CPA2002-06, CPA2002-08, CPA2002-11, CPA2002-13, CPA2002-15, CPA2002-19, and CPA2002-22.

The aforementioned amendments amend the text of the Lee Plan including the Future Land Use Map series, the Transportation Map Series, and the tables of the Lee Plan. A brief summary of the content of those amendments is set forth below:

CPA2002-06 (Outlying Suburban Residential Allocations)

Amend Table 1(b), Planning Community Year 2020 Allocations, by correcting the Outlying Suburban Allocation for the Alva Community.

CPA2002-08 (Conservation Lands)

Amend the Future Land Use Map Series, Map 1, by updating the Conservation Lands Future Land Use Categories.

CPA2002-11 (Buckingham Potable Water)

Amend Goal 17, Buckingham, of the Future Land Use Element by adding language that allows the extension of water lines to serve the Buckingham Rural Community Preserve on a voluntary basis, with cost of extension to be paid by the petitioner. Amend Map 6, Future Water Service Areas, to show the Buckingham Rural Community Preserve to be within the Future Water Service Areas of the County. Amendment Map 7, Future Sewer Service Areas, to add certain public facility sites (Gulf Coast Center and Tice Fire Station) to the Future Sanitary Sewer Service Area Map.

CPA2002-13 (Financially Feasible Transportation Map)

Amend the Transportation Maps of the Future Land Use Map Series and related policy references to reflect the most recent Lee County MPO 2020 Financially Feasible Transportation Plan Map.

CPA2002-15 (Constrained Roads)

Update Table 2(a), Constrained Roads/State and County Roads, to eliminate Old U.S. 41, which is now a City of Bonita Springs road.

CPA2002-19 (Capital Improvements Program)

Amend the Capital Improvements Element (Tables 3 and 4) to reflect the most recently adopted Capital Improvement Program.

CPA2002-22 (Policy 100.2.3. Text Update)

Amend Policy 100.2.3. of the Housing Element by replacing the outdated reference to the "special permit" approval process with the current process of "special exception."

The corresponding Staff Reports and Analysis, along with all attachments for these amendments are adopted as "Support Documentation" for the Lee 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 must be consistent with the Lee Plan as 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 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 the 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 the 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 other appropriate word or phrase in order to accomplish this intention; and regardless of whether 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 Administrative 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 the amendment 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 such 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 Albion, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Janes, and, when put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Robert P. Janes	Aye
Douglas St. Cerny	Aye
Ray Judah	Aye
Andrew Coy	Absent
John Albion	Aye

DONE AND ADOPTED this 23rd day of October 2003.

ATTEST:
CHARLIE GREEN, CLERK

BY: *Isa S. Pierce*
Deputy Clerk

LEE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

BY: *Ray Judah*
Chairman

DATE: 10/23/03

Approved as to form by:

Donna Marie Collins
Donna Marie Collins
County Attorney's Office



Charlie Green
Clerk of Circuit Court
Lee County, Florida

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF LEE


I Charlie Green, Clerk of Circuit Court, Lee County, Florida, and ex-Officio Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners, Lee County, Florida, do hereby Certify that the above and foregoing, is a true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 03-19, adopted by the Board of Lee County Commissioners, at their meeting held on the 23rd day of October 2003 and same filed in the Clerk's Office.

Given under my hand and seal, at Fort Myers, Florida, this 27th day of October 2003.

CHARLIE GREEN,
Clerk of Circuit Court
Lee County, Florida

By:


Deputy Clerk



**CPA2002-06
OUTLYING SUBURBAN
RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATIONS
BoCC SPONSORED
AMENDMENT
TO THE**

LEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

THE LEE PLAN

BoCC Adoption Document

**Lee County Planning Division
1500 Monroe Street
P.O. Box 398
Fort Myers, FL 33902-0398
(239) 479-8585**

October 24, 2003

**LEE COUNTY
DIVISION OF PLANNING
STAFF REPORT FOR
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT
CPA2002-06**



Text Amendment



Map Amendment

This Document Contains the Following Reviews:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Staff Review
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Planning Agency Review and Recommendation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Board of County Commissioners Hearing for Transmittal
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Staff Response to the DCA Objections, Recommendations, and Comments (ORC) Report
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Board of County Commissioners Hearing for Adoption

STAFF REPORT PREPARATION DATE: April 18th 2003

PART I - BACKGROUND AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION

A. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

1. APPLICANT:

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

2. REQUEST:

Amend Table 1(b), Planning Community Year 2020 Allocations, by correcting the Outlying Suburban Allocation for the Alva Community.

B. STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY

1. RECOMMENDATION:

Planning staff recommends the Board of County Commissioners transmit the proposed amendment to table 1(b). Staff recommends that Table 1(b) be revised to correct an error in the reallocations made in PAM/T 99-20 which allocated all residential acreage for the Outlying Suburban Future Land Use category in the Alva Planning Community to the new Bayshore Planning Community. The amended table will show an allocation of 15 acres for residential development in the Outlying Suburban category in the Alva Planning Community and an allocation of 749 residential acres in the Outlying Suburban category in the Bayshore Planning Community. (See Attachment 1)

2. BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:

- No change in the overall county accommodation is proposed
- No changes in any future land use category allocation are proposed.
- The previous amendments to the Planning Community Allocations removed all of the residential potential from lands designated Outlying Suburban in the Alva Community.
- Currently there are 4 acres of existing residential uses in the Alva Community designated Outlying Suburban.
- The Outlying Suburban area of the Alva Community has 53 acres of vacant land remaining for future development and 58 acres of agricultural uses which could be converted to other uses.
- Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) projections were formulated using the adopted Lee Plan Planning Community allocations as "control totals" and the zonal forecasts nest within each community.
- TAZ projections indicate that 9 additional units will be built in the Alva Planning Community in the Outlying Suburban area.
- Current development patterns in the Outlying Suburban area of Alva are at a density of 2 units per acre.
- The Bayshore Community is allocated 764 residential acres in the Outlying Suburban area and 295 acres of this allocation was from the original Alva Planning Community.
- There are 550 acres of residential uses in the Bayshore Planning Community in the area designated Outlying Suburban. Of these, 172 acres were in the original Alva Planning Community.
- There are currently 893 acres in agricultural use and 391 vacant acres remaining in the Outlying Suburban areas of the Bayshore Planning Community. Of these, 109 acres of agricultural use and 83 vacant acres are in the area that was previously in the Alva Planning Community.
- TAZ projections indicate that 129 additional units will be built in the Bayshore Planning Community in the Outlying Suburban area that was originally in the Alva Planning Community. Also, the current development patterns, in the Bayshore Community, include a residential density of 1.5 units per acre in the Outlying

Suburban areas; however, the area previously in the Alva Community has a density closer to 2 units per acre.

C. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The acreage allocation table (Lee Plan Table 1(b)) was amended by PAM/T 99-20 to adjust the allocations to address the creation of two new Planning Communities and changes in market conditions that occurred since Table 1(b) was adopted in 1998. This amendment created the new Bayshore Planning Community from the existing Alva and North Fort Myers Communities. The amendment did not alter the countywide allocation accommodation of the Lee Plan. Allocation adjustments required by changes in the planning community boundaries were based on the existing allocations, the existing landuse inventory, and the adopted TAZ projections. Allocation adjustments were also made to reflect market condition changes that became evident after the adoption of Table 1(b) in 1998.

During the codification process, staff identified an error in PAM/T 99-20 and asked the Board of County Commissioners to initiate an amendment to correct the misallocation. The staff report for PAM/T 99-20 included the following incorrect statement:

"The area of the new Bayshore Planning Community currently in the Alva Planning Community has the following Future Land Use Map designations: Density Reduction/Groundwater Resources, Rural, Outlying Suburban, Public Facilities, and Wetlands. Since no property designated Outlying Suburban will remain in the Alva Community, the entire Outlying Suburban allocation, of 295 acres should be re-allocated to the Bayshore Community. "

The staff analysis for PAM/T 99-20 overlooked the 145 acres of Outlying Suburban that is located in the Alva Planning Community south of the Caloosahatchee River just north of the Lehigh Acres Planning Community (See Attachment 2). This area has existing and potential residential development. This amendment addresses the error made in the previous amendment.

PART II - STAFF ANALYSIS

A. STAFF DISCUSSION

Origin of Lee Plan Table 1(b) (Planning Community Allocations) and Map 16

The Planning Community Allocations were adopted into the Lee Plan in the Lee Plan EAR Addendum cycle. The creation of this table and map was the topic of PAM/T 96-13, which addressed the need to replace the original "Year 2010 Overlay." The 2010 Overlay was a result of the 1989 Settlement Agreement between Lee County and the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). This agreement required the County to amend the Future Land Use Map Series by designating the proposed distribution, extent, and location of the generalized land uses required by Rule 9J-5.006(4)(a)1.-9 for the year 2010. This was accomplished by creating 115 sub-districts, generally nesting within the existing adopted Planning Districts and allocating, within each sub-district, the projected acreage totals for each generalized land use needed to accommodate the projected 2010 population. Policies added to the plan provided that no development approvals would be issued in a sub-district that would cause the allocated acreage for that land use category to be exceeded. The Overlay was a device designed to reconcile the population accommodation capacity of the Future Land Use Map (estimated to be 70 years in 1989) with the 20-year time frame in the text of the element. It was also designed to provide more certainty to the extent and location of future commercial and industrial development.

The Year 2010 Overlay was exceptionally difficult to administer. Some of the initial problems experienced by the staff included the inadequacy of the original inventory. There was a lack of a reliable existing land use database to monitor the use of land, which drew down the available acres in each sub-district. Finally, there was difficulty in explaining the concept and regulatory nature of the overlay to the public. A major effort was directed to resolve these problems. The Sheridan vs. Lee County Final Order required an amendment to the Lee Plan effecting the implementation of the "Year 2010 Overlay". Prior to this final order, the overlay was implemented at the building permit stage. The final order required all development order approvals to be consistent with the overlay. This amendment also required the Planning Division to create a parcel specific database to track the use of land in conjunction with the 2010 sub-district allocations. This requirement resolved the monitoring issue that was considered the largest obstacle in establishing a workable overlay. Other issues with the original overlay, however, could not be resolved in a principled and satisfactory manner. The 1994 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) included a proposal to remove the overlay from the Lee Plan. Final Order No. AC-96-11 was issued on July 25, 1996. The Final Order specified that the 1994 EAR based amendments, which proposed the deletion of the Year 2010 Overlay, were not in compliance with Chapter 163, Part II, F.S., and Rule 9J-5, FAC. The Final

Order required Lee County to rescind, and not make effective, all of the amendments, which sought to delete the Year 2010 Overlay.

Lee County's 1996 EAR Addendum Cycle included a proposed replacement to the "Year 2010 Overlay." This amendment (PAM/T 96-13) proposed replacement of 115 sub-districts with twenty community-based districts (Planning Communities). In comparison, the average size of the 115 sub-districts was four thousand acres, while, the average size of the new Planning Communities is twenty thousand acres. The increase in size allowed for increased flexibility in the regulation. The acreage allocations for the Planning Communities only regulate residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The time horizon of the allocations was extended to the year 2020. The 2020 population forecast used for the allocations was also reduced from the 797,288 as adopted in the EAR to the Bureau of Economic and Business Research's (BEBR) mid-range population projection of 602,000. This amendment to the Lee Plan became effective on July 30, 1998.

Following the adoption of the Planning Community map and Allocation table, planning staff initiated a work program to further break down the residential, commercial, and industrial needs of the unincorporated areas into the existing traffic analysis zone boundaries. This allowed the county's transportation needs model to be run using land use data consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan. Since the planning community allocations are monitored semi-annually, the base data used for the TAZ project included an additional 2 years of development data. Breaking down the allocations from the Planning Community to the TAZ level with the aid of additional data gave the planning staff the opportunity to monitor the accuracy of the original Table 1(b) allocations. This table allocates residential acres by Lee Plan future land use categories as well as planning communities. The TAZ residential projections were also done by future land use categories. This analysis also included an additional 2 years of zoning/planned development approval information. This additional information allowed planning staff the opportunity to assess how actual development was occurring in comparison to the planning community allocations.

The Planning Community Map and Allocation Table (Map 16 and Table 1(b)) were amended during the 2000/2001 amendment cycle, which was adopted January 10, 2002 by the BoCC. This amendment was initiated to address events that occurred following the adoption of the original communities map and allocations. For example, in the spring of 2000, The MPO adopted new TAZ forecasts, two community planning efforts initiated and more were anticipated due to funding provided by the county for community plans, the City of Bonita Springs incorporated, and The City of Fort Myers annexed land outside of the Fort Myers Planning Community. The TAZ zonal data, which was overseen by planning staff, showed areas of the county where the allocations were not in keeping with actual development. Since the residential allocations are

specific to Future Land Use categories as well as the planning community, these allocations are for smaller geographic areas than the commercial and industrial allocations. The smaller sized areas reduce the flexibility of the allocations which has caused the residential allocations to require more frequent adjustments as development occurs. Each of the Lee Plan FLUM categories allows a range of densities for residential and therefore, new development may not replicate the assumptions used in developing the acreage allocations. The boundaries of the two community planning efforts were divided by exiting planning community boundaries on Map 16. The incorporated City of Bonita Springs also did not follow the Planning Community boundaries on Map 16. It was decided that the Planning Communities map and the allocation table should be "fine tuned" to reflect these changes. The major result of this amendment was the creation of the Bayshore and Estero Planning Communities and a number of re-allocations of acreages on Table 1(b). Since population projections were not changed from the time the original allocations were adopted, the allocation table was only amended to reflect market shifts, the adjustments to Map 16, and major Future Land Use Map amendments. The allocation changes did not increase or decrease the countywide accommodation of residential (population), commercial, or industrial development. Shifts in development location necessitated re-allocation of residential acreages between Future Land Use Map (FLUM) categories. Since FLUM categories assume different residential densities, to ensure the population accommodation of the Lee Plan remained consistent with the adopted population projection, the revised Table 1(b) does not have the same county wide residential acreage allocation as was originally adopted in 1998. Also, the allocation table regulates areas in the unincorporated portion of Lee County so the incorporation of Bonita Springs greatly reduced the acreage allocations on Table 1(b).

Proposed Changes

This amendment addresses the error made in the last amendment to Table 1(b). PAM/T 99-20 incorrectly stated that with the creation of the Bayshore Planning Community, there would be no land designated "Outlying Suburban" in the Alva Planning Community. In fact, of the 805 acres in the original Alva Planning Community designated Outlying Suburban, 145 acres (18%) remained in the Alva Planning Community and 660 acres (82%) were in the area that became the Bayshore Planning Community (Attachment 3 – Future Land Use Map Acreage Breakdown). An amendment (CPA2000-09) reviewed and adopted concurrently with PAM/T 99-20 re-classified 239 acres in this area from Outlying Suburban to Conservation Lands. This change was part of a map amendment that is processed periodically to reflected purchases of land, by Lee County through the Conservation Lands Acquisition and Stewardship Program (Conservation 20/20), for preservation purposes. Planning staff was aware of that the River Run RPD was under review for purchase prior to the map change and had incorporated this status in the residential allocations. Therefore, the reclassification to Conservation Lands does not impact the Outlying Suburban allocations in the

Alva/Bayshore planning communities. It does changes the percentage analysis of this land use category from an 18/82 percent split to a 25/75 percent Alva/Bayshore split.

If a percentage split were applied to the original Alva allocation of Outlying Suburban residential, 74 acres would remain allocated to the Alva Planning Community and 211 acres would be allocated to the Bayshore Planning Community. However, only 4 acres are currently developed with residential uses in the Alva Planning Community's Outlying Suburban area (Attachment 4 – Existing Land Use Inventory). Therefore, an allocation of 74 acres would result in 70 acres remaining for future residential development. This allocation would accommodate residential uses on over 50% of the land in this portion of the Alva Planning Community. To utilize this allocation, much of the existing agricultural use in the area would need to be converted to residential use. Furthermore, this allocation could potentially accommodate 210 additional dwelling units in the area at a density of 3 units per acre. At the current density in the area, 2 units per acre, this allocation would accommodate 140 additional dwelling units. Given that this particular area of the county is somewhat remote and predominately agricultural in nature, the TAZ projections estimated that by the year 2020 only 18 additional units would be built in this area. Staff also notes that the last new dwelling unit built in this area was in 1995. Assuming the historic development patterns in this area will continue (2 du/acre), to accommodate the projected growth only 9 acres need to be allocated for the anticipated residential growth in the Alva Planning Community for the Outlying Suburban category. At a minimum, to accommodate the existing and projected growth this area requires a residential allocation of 13 acres. Staff recommends that 15 acres be allocated to the Alva Planning Community in the Outlying Suburban land use category allowing for some deviation from historical development trends and increased market demand.

The land in the Alva Planning Community designated Outlying Suburban that was included in the Bayshore Planning Community is forecast in the TAZ projections to increase by 129 dwelling for a total of 708 units by the year 2020 (Attachment 3). Within this area, 5 additional units have been built, since the TAZ projections were adopted in the spring of 2000. This area has also been developed at 2 units per acre, with the exception of one mobile home/RV park that was developed in the mid-1970's at a density closer to 8 units per acre. Assuming the historic development patterns continue, this area will require an additional allocation of 65 acres to accommodate the projected growth. Today, there are 579 units on 172 acres of land existing in this area as inventoried by the Planning Division. Therefore, the Outlying Suburban area of the Bayshore Planning Community that was previously in the Alva Planning Community requires an allocation of 237 acres for existing and projected residential uses. The original Alva Planning Community residential allocation for Outlying Suburban was 295 acres. The analysis of future needs demonstrates that only 250 acres are needed to accommodate the estimated

growth. This growth estimate and land accommodation need is based on the adopted MPO TAZ forecasts and historical development patterns. Given that the original Alva Outlying Suburban allocation for residential was 295 acres, there remains a difference of 45 acres between the need and allocation. While the purchase of the River Run RPD did reduce the total amount of land available for future residential development, this area has incurred more development interest than the Outlying Suburban area in the Alva Planning Community. Therefore, staff recommends that 43 additional acres be allocated to the Bayshore Planning Community (2 of the 45 acres have been recommended to be allocated to the Alva Planning Community).

Additional Justification For The Proposed Alva/Bayshore Residential Allocation Split

The Bayshore Planning Community has two areas designated Outlying Suburban. One is the area between SR 78 and the Caloosahatchee River and the other is located east of I-75, north of SR 78, along Pritchett Parkway (Attachments 2 & 5). The area south of SR 78 is the portion that was in the Alva Planning Community. As riverfront property in other areas of the county continues to develop, this area will be subject to increased development interest. The area north of SR 78 is the larger of the two areas with a total acreage of over 2,000 acres. This area has over 900 acres of existing agricultural uses and 390 acres of vacant land. The Bayshore Community Plan (Lee Plan Goal 20) does address non-residential uses within the community boundaries. Retail commercial development is allowed at a limited number of locations and restricted in the areas outside of the General Interchange area to minor commercial uses. Non-retail commercial uses are permitted elsewhere consistent to the Lee Plan and the Land Development Code. The plan also states no new industrial activities or rezonings are permitted. The plan clearly directs development to a more residential nature. One change in conditions that has occurred since the staff report for PAM/T 99-20 was issued is the application for a 1525 dwelling unit development in the area of Outlying Suburban along Pritchett Parkway. As currently proposed, this development will require a residential allocation of 453 acres. With the current residential allocation of 764 acres and existing inventory of 550 acres of residential development in the Outlying Suburban area of the Bayshore Planning Community, if approved, this development will not be able to "build out". By correcting the mistake of PAM/T 99-20, the Bayshore allocation will be reduced to 749 acres. While this proposed development is not approved and there is no guarantee that it will be built as proposed or by the year 2020, the application for a new residential development demonstrates that there is current interest to develop in this area of the county. Given the location, accessibility issues, and other amenities, the Outlying Suburban area of Bayshore is anticipated to develop sooner than the area in the Alva Planning Community which is more remote/rural and has inferior access (Attachment 5). Therefore, staff recommends that the balance of the residential allocation not needed to accommodate the TAZ forecasted growth remain in the Bayshore Planning Community.

B. CONCLUSIONS

Map 16, the Planning Community Map, should be amended to correct an error from the staff report for PAM/T 99-20. This amendment will not alter the overall county population accommodation and will only effect the residential allocations on Table 1(b). Furthermore, this amendment only addresses the allocations for Outlying Suburban residential development in the Alva and Bayshore Planning Communities. The methodology used to formulate the proposed split of the 295 acre residential allocation is the same as was used in the PAM/T 99-20 staff analysis and is consistent with the adopted TAZ forecasts.

C. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Planning staff recommends that the Board of County Commissioners transmit the proposed amendment. Staff recommends that Lee Plan Table 1(b), the Planning Communities Acreage Allocation Table, be amended to correct an error made in the staff report for PAM/T 99-20. The proposed amendment will correct Table 1(b) by including a residential allocation for Outlying Suburban in the Alva Planning Community. The amended table will show an allocation of 15 acres for residential development in the Outlying Suburban category in the Alva Planning Community and an allocation of 749 residential acres in the Outlying Suburban category in the Bayshore Planning Community. (See Attachment 1)

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

PUBLIC HEARING DATE. April 28, 2003

A. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW

Staff made a brief presentation to outline the amendment followed by questions from the LPA. One member of the LPA asked if this amendment would be impacted by the ongoing Alva Community Planning efforts. Staff explained that no proposal was being made in that planning effort to adjust the residential allocations. The chairperson called for public comments and received none.

B. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** The Local Planning Agency recommends that the Board of County Commissioners transmit the proposed amendment to the Florida Department of Community Affairs.
2. **BASIS AND RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT:** The LPA concurred with the findings of fact as contained in the staff report

C. VOTE:

NOEL ANDRESS	<u>Aye</u>
MATT BIXLER	<u>Aye</u>
SUSAN BROOKMAN	<u>Aye</u>
DAN DELISI	<u>Aye</u>
RONALD INGE	<u>Aye</u>
GORDON REIGELMAN	<u>Absent</u>

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

DATE OF TRANSMITTAL HEARING: June 25, 2003

A. BOARD REVIEW: The Board of County Commissioners provided no discussion concerning the proposed plan amendment. This item was approved on the consent agenda for the June 25, 2003 public hearing.

B. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. BOARD ACTION: The Board of County Commissioners voted to transmit the proposed plan amendment to the Department of Community Affairs.

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

C. VOTE:

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

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

DATE OF ORC REPORT: September 5, 2003

- A. DCA OBJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS:** The DCA had no objections, recommendations, or comments concerning this amendment.

- B. STAFF RESPONSE:** Adopt the amendment as transmitted.

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

DATE OF ADOPTION HEARING: October 23, 2003

D. BOARD REVIEW: The Board of County Commissioners provided no discussion concerning the proposed plan amendment. This item was approved on the consent agenda for the October 23, 2003 public hearing.

E. BOARD ACTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT SUMMARY:

1. BOARD ACTION: The Board of County Commissioners voted to adopt the proposed plan amendment.

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

F. 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>

Proposed Table 1(b)
Planning Community Year 2020 Allocations (portion of entire table)


Future Land Use Category		Lee County Totals	Alva	All other Planning Communities	Bayshore
<i>Residential By Future Land Use Category</i>	Intensive Development	1,493		<i>No changes are proposed in the Boca Grande, Bonita Springs, Fort Myers Shores, Burnt Store, Cape Coral, Capitoa, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Gateway/ Airport, Daniels Parkway, Iona/ McGregor, San Carlos, Sanibel, South Fort Myers, Pine Island, Lehigh Acres, Southeast Lee County, North Fort Myers, Buckingham, Estero</i>	
	Central Urban	9,558			
	Urban Community	13,077	519		
	Suburban	15,448			
	Outlying Suburban	4,931	15		764 749
	Industrial	96			
	Public Facilities	2			
	University Community	860			
	Industrial Interchange				
	General Interchange	53			12
	General Commercial Interchange	7			
	Industrial Commercial Interchange				
	University Village Interchange				
	New Community	1,644			
	Airport Commerce	9			
	Airport				
	Rural	8,977	1,419		1,251
	Rural Community Preserve	3,046			
	Outer Island	215	5		
	Open Lands	2,091	175		1,236
	Density Reduction/ Groundwater Resource	5,544	40		1,837
	Wetlands				
Unincorporated County Total Residential		67,051	2,173		5,085
Commercial		9,460	46		104
Industrial		6,311	26		3
<i>Non-Regulatory Allocations</i>					
Public		58,676	3,587		1,462
Active AG		34,145	6,098		1,321
Passive AG		65,522	14,633		4,393
Conservation		79,488	2,236		798
Vacant		44,720	1,525		1,310
Total		365,373	30,324		14,476

Future Land Use Map

Map 1

Page 1 of 5

Map Generated April 2003



Planning Communities

- Alva
- Bayshore
- Original Planning Community Boundary

Future Urban Areas:

- Urban Community
- Outlying Suburban
- Public Facilities

Interstate Highway Interchange Areas:


- General

Non-Urban Areas:

- Rural
- Outer Island
- Open Lands
- Density Reduction/Groundwater Resource
- Conservation Lands - Uplands

Wetlands:

- Wetlands
- Conservation Lands - Wetlands



Future Land Use Map Acreage Totals By Planning Community

Future Land Use Category	Alva	Bayshore	
		from Alva	from North Fort Myers
Intensive Development			
Central Urban			
Urban Community	1,463		
Suburban			
Outlying Suburban	145	422	1,750
Industrial			
Public Facilities	53	110	86
University Community			
Industrial Interchange			
General Interchange			141
General Commercial Interchange			
Industrial Commercial Interchange			
University Village Interchange			
New Community			
Airport Commerce			
Airport			
Rural	14,287	2,198	729
Rural Community Preserve			
Outer Island	19		
Open Lands	7,245		3,560
Density Reduction/Groundwater Resource	6,645	2,178	2,089
Upland Conservation Lands	1,508	239	39
Wetlands	2,175	570	242
Wetland Conservation Lands	237	131	11
Total Future Land Use Map Acreages	33,777	5,848	8,647

Note: Acreage totals on the Future Land Use Map Table do not match acreage totals from the existing land use inventory due to rights of way and other lands not identified with a STRAP number.

EXISTING LANDUSE INVENTORY

For the Outlying Suburban Areas of the Alva and Bayshore Planning Communities

Summarized by year for individual Traffic Analysis Zones

	Existing Acreages By Use								Residential Units by Type						
	Total Acreage	Commercial	Industrial	Public/Quasi Public	Active Ag	Passive Ag	Wetlands	Vacant	Residential	Total	Single Family	Duplex	Multi Family	Mobile Homes	RVs Non Transient
Alva Planning Community															
Traffic Anaylysis Zone 163 - (portion)															
	Non-Residential acreages by year are not included on this report								0						
Summary for 1973									0.23	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1983									0.36	1	1	0	0	0	0
TAZ #163 Total	31.4	0	0	0	14.52	10.13	0	6.16	0.59	2	2	0	0	0	0
Traffic Anaylysis Zone 188															
	Non-Residential acreages by year are not included on this report								0						
Summary for 1973									0.38	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1983									1.34	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1993									0.45	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1995									1.26	2	2	0	0	0	0
TAZ #188 Total	83.64	0	0	0	0	33.32	0	46.69	3.43	7	7	0	0	0	0
Summary For Alva	115.04	0	0	0	14.52	43.45	0	52.85	4.02	9	9	0	0	0	0
Bayshore Planning Community															
Traffic Anaylysis Zone 109 - (originally in North Fort Myers)															
	Non-Residential acreages by year are not included on this report								0						
Summary for 1935									0.39	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1950									0.16	1	0	0	0	1	0
Summary for 1958									1.8	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1970									4.08	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1972									0.66	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1973									1.5	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1974									0.33	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1975									2.88	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1980									3.56	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1981									0.99	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1982									0.38	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1983									1.33	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1985									3.52	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1986									1.45	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1987									2.72	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1988									0.75	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1990									0.5	1	0	0	0	1	0
Summary for 1991									0.43	1	1	0	0	0	0



	Existing Acreages By Use									Residential Units by Type					
	Total Acreage	Commercial	Industrial	Public/Quasi Public	Active Ag	Passive Ag	Wetlands	Vacant	Residential	Total	Single Family	Duplex	Multi Family	Mobile Homes	RVs Non Transient
Summary for 1993									5.11	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1994									9.79	6	5	0	0	1	0
Summary for 1995									3.05	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1996									1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1998									19.84	1	0	0	0	1	0
Summary for 2001									1	1	1	0	0	0	0
TAZ #109 Total	214.59	0.17	0	0.16	27.87	11.18	0.89	107.1	67.22	38	34	0	0	4	0
Traffic Anaylysis Zone 111 - (originally in North Fort Myers)															
	Non-Residential acreages by year are not included on this report								0						
Summary for 1991									0.53	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1992									0.76	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1996									1.76	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 2001									0.63	1	1	0	0	0	0
TAZ #111 Total	21.52	0	0	0	0	0	9.76	8.08	3.68	4	4	0	0	0	0
Traffic Anaylysis Zone 117 - (originally in North Fort Myers)															
	Non-Residential acreages by year are not included on this report								0						
Summary for 1946									0.75	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1950									6.1	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1955									3.21	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1956									4.87	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1957									18.62	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1958									6.92	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1964									2.91	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1965									1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1966									7.4	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1967									2.2	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1968									3.51	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1970									1.37	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1971									6.19	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1974									16.62	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1975									7.05	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1978									6.52	9	9	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1979									1.29	5	5	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1980									12.4	11	11	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1981									1.8	4	4	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1982									0.26	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1983									13.78	6	5	0	0	1	0
Summary for 1984									2.72	7	7	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1985									5.83	12	12	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1986									6	5	5	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1987									7.98	11	11	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1988									16.1	13	13	0	0	0	0

	Existing Acreages By Use								Residential Units by Type						
	Total Acreage	Commercial	Industrial	Public/Quasi Public	Active Ag	Passive Ag	Wetlands	Vacant	Residential	Total	Single Family	Duplex	Multi Family	Mobile Homes	RVs Non Transient
Summary for 1985									6.2	9	9	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1990									21.09	9	9	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1991									11.75	6	6	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1992									5.84	7	7	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1993									13.54	9	9	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1994									9.67	7	7	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1995									3.02	6	6	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1996									6.13	6	6	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1997									13.53	6	6	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1998									5.23	6	5	0	0	1	0
Summary for 1999									0.69	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 2000									5.91	5	5	0	0	0	0
Summary for 2001									4.43	6	5	0	0	1	0
Summary for 2002									8.94	8	8	0	0	0	0
TAZ #117 Total	1316.65	22.45	0	8.25	75.26	724	35.65	171.63	279.41	200	197	0	0	3	0
Traffic Anaylysis Zone 151 - (originally in North Fort Myers)															
	Non-Residential acreages by year are not included on this report								0						
Summary for 1958									0.94	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1961									1.37	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1962									1.87	3	1	2	0	0	0
Summary for 1963									4.35	8	8	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1964									2.09	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1965									0.6	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1971									2.57	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1973									1.03	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1974									1.01	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1975									0.39	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1976									0.99	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1977									2.13	5	5	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1978									1.76	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1979									0.92	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1982									1.77	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1986									0.95	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1988									1.21	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1989									0.5	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1996									0.36	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 2000									0.51	1	1	0	0	0	0
TAZ #151 Total	54.08	0	0	3.68	0	1.74	0	21.34	27.32	43	41	2	0	0	0
Traffic Anaylysis Zone 155 - (originally in Alva)															
	Non-Residential acreages by year are not included on this report								0						
Summary for 1940									3.15	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1958									9.01	1	1	0	0	0	0

	Existing Acreages By Use									Residential Units by Type					
	Total Acreage	Commercial	Industrial	Public/Quasi Public	Active Ag	Passive Ag	Wetlands	Vacant	Residential	Total	Single Family	Duplex	Multi Family	Mobile Homes	RVs Non Transient
Summary for 1960									2.44	4	4	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1961									5.85	5	5	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1962									2.34	5	5	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1963									0.64	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1964									0.5	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1965									1.14	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1966									14.31	2	1	0	0	1	0
Summary for 1967									1.5	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1970									21.76	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1971									3.3	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1972									0.52	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1973									0.44	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1974									35.21	281	2	0	0	162	117
Summary for 1975									4.71	8	8	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1976									2.99	9	9	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1977									4.9	9	9	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1978									3.23	8	8	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1979									3.42	10	10	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1980									0.77	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1981									0.59	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1982									1.24	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1983									1.6	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1984									7.35	51	3	0	48	0	0
Summary for 1985									4.35	26	2	0	24	0	0
Summary for 1986									1.11	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1987									2.63	10	4	0	6	0	0
Summary for 1988									3.63	22	4	0	18	0	0
Summary for 1989									2.06	6	6	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1990									6.17	31	7	0	24	0	0
Summary for 1991									0.95	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1992									0.4	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1993									4.5	7	7	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1994									1.15	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1995									5.95	42	2	0	40	0	0
Summary for 1996									0.74	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1997									2.08	3	3	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1998									0.37	1	1	0	0	0	0
Summary for 1999									1.56	2	2	0	0	0	0
Summary for 2000									1.36	3	3	0	0	0	0
TAZ #155 Total	394.25	2.27	0	23.86	4.07	44.54	64.84	82.75	171.92	579	139	0	160	163	117
Summary For Bayshore	2001.13	24.89	0	35.99	107.2	781.46	111.14	390.9	549.55	864	415	2	160	170	117





Outlying Suburban Areas In the Bayshore and Alva Planning Communities

Map Generated April 2003



LEGEND

Date of Aerial: 2002

-  Planning Community Boudary
-  Split Between original Alva and North Fort Myers Planning Communities
-  Outlying Suburban Designation
-  Other FLUM Designations

