

MINUTES REPORT
LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(LDCAC)
Friday, February 13, 2026
8:30 a.m.

Committee Members Present:

Jay Johnson	Al Quattrone
Randy Krise, Vice Chair	Amy Thibaut, Chair
Jack Morris	Patrick Vanasse
Christopher Scott	

Excused / Absent:

Allie Beecher	Jarod Prentice
Stephen Coleman	Jennifer Sapen
Veronica Martin	

Lee County Government Staff Present:

Michael Jacob, Deputy Asst. County Atty.	Janet Miller, DCD Admin.
Brandon Dunn, Planning Manager	Brian Roberts, Development Services Manager

AGENDA ITEM 1 - CALL TO ORDER/REVIEW OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

Ms. Thibaut, 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. Michael Jacob, Deputy County Attorney, reviewed the Affidavit of Posting and found it legally sufficient as to form and content.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chair

Mr. Krise made a motion to nominate Ms. Thibaut as Chair. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vanasse. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 7-0.

Vice Chair

Mr. Scott made a motion to nominate Mr. Krise as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vanasse. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 7-0.

AGENDA ITEM 3 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 14, 2025

Mr. Krise made a motion to approve the November 14, 2025 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 7-0.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

A. Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements

Mr. Roberts provided an overview of the amendments and was available for questions.

Mr. Krise asked if there were any changes to the actual numbers of parking spaces.

Mr. Roberts stated there were no changes to the number of parking spaces. That specific language will remain in Chapter 34. He explained that there were some changes to references in the parking calculations in Chapter 34. He referred the Committee to the special notes and regulations section on Page 14 of 22. He noted that some of the numbers were corrected and some were removed in order to be consistent with the Code being cleaned up, but none of the numbers of parking spaces is being changed as part of this amendment.

Mr. Morris stated that was one of his questions too because there seemed to be a large section of additions and swapping, but no actual changes.

Mr. Roberts stated that the swapping is all of the parking lot design criteria that was in Chapter 34 being relocated to Chapter 10.

Mr. Morris stated the amendments include updating references as well.

Mr. Roberts stated that is correct.

Mr. Quattrone referred to (e)(1)(c) on Page 3 of 22 (Parking lot entrances) where it says, "*Maximum throat width at property line is 35 feet.*" Mr. Quattrone noted there have been issues at times, for instance, when there is a property line that is close to the edge of pavement. By the time radiuses are included as you measure the property line, you can end up with 15 feet or less of a throat width. He asked if the verbiage could be changed to say, "*Maximum throat width is 35 feet.*"

Mr. Roberts stated the verbiage in (e)(1)(c) has always been there. He referred the Committee to (e)(3) on the same page which allows for a manager's determination for other special circumstances that warrant other parking lot entrance requirements.

Mr. Quattrone stated that many times developers submit a standard set of development order plans. If they put a standard 24 foot drive aisle going in at the property line, they have well in excess of 35 feet. Because of this, they always get a denial comment that says they do not meet the requirements in a certain section of the Code, which results in them having to go through the extra step of asking Mr. Roberts for permission.

Mr. Dunn stated staff would make note of this comment. Staff will consult with the Department of Transportation to see if they have any concerns.

Mr. Roberts stated he had seen examples of what Mr. Quattrone is referring to. He felt there might be times that there could be an issue with communication with the lead reviewers. There may be an internal issue that staff has to look into.

Mr. Quattrone stated there are times they have been asked to do deviations to their planned developments. Because of something in the Code, they have to submit for an Administrative Deviation.

Mr. Jacob asked how Mr. Quattrone would like the verbiage to be written.

Mr. Quattrone suggested removing the words *“at the property line”* and replace it with *“Maximum throat width is 35 feet.”* He felt the intent of the Code is to not have a throat width of more than 35 feet. He did not have an issue with the 35 feet but felt the words *“at the property line”* should be removed so that someone is not restricted at the true throat width.

Mr. Morris felt there should at least be an exception in the language. Staff could add to the verbiage to account for flares or the turn radius.

Mr. Quattrone stated the language could be *“Maximum throat width at property is 35 feet excluding flare widths or radiuses and flares.”*

Mr. Morris stated the language comes out of the FDOT manual.

Mr. Roberts stated that the FDOT manual references the architectural code with the throat distance, etc. He felt staff could carry over some of that language.

Mr. Vanasse referred to (4) b. at the top of Page 5 of 22 where it references a *“continuous landscape buffer.”* He asked if the intent is to have a buffer or a landscape island which is the more common term. He noted that when the term *“buffer”* is used, people assume there is a hedge planting or some sort of planting(s) going in.

Mr. Scott concurred that he also preferred the term *“landscape island.”*

Mr. Roberts stated that *“separated by a landscape median area”* is how it has been interpreted but staff will clarify the language.

Mr. Scott referred to item (2) on the same page dealing with *“Low turnover parking lots.”* He noted that he had been working on a few church projects lately and they have stabilized sub grade with grass for overflow parking. He asked if that could be allowed instead of prohibiting it.

Mr. Roberts stated there is another code section that allows churches specifically to use grass parking, but only churches.

Mr. Vanasse questioned whether this item needed to be in the Land Development Code if there are allowances elsewhere. He suggested cross-referencing if that is the case.

Mr. Morris referred to comments by staff regarding updating the references. He asked if some additions were necessary now that staff is taking items from one section and moving them to another section. For instance, would there be some added cross references included?

Mr. Dunn believed staff caught all of them but encouraged the committee members to notify staff if they see any that were missed.

Mr. Morris stated he was thinking of a larger umbrella that says, *“Design standards in this entire section are now located in Chapter 10”* or *“See Chapter 10.”*

Mr. Dunn stated he understands his point and that staff would look into it further. If further clarity is needed, staff can make those adjustments.

Mr. Vanasse referred to an earlier comment by Mr. Scott about parking on the grass. He asked if staff could give allowances for other businesses to park on the grass besides churches such as certain types of events or sports venues. He asked if it could be expanded. Staff agreed to look into possibly expanding that.

Mr. Scott made a motion to approve Off-Street Parking and Loading requirements with the committee's comments as noted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Krise. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 7-0.

B. Outdoor Lighting Standards

Mr. Roberts provided an overview of the amendments and was available for questions.

Mr. Vanasse referred to (c)(2) regarding Lamp standards on Page 2 where it says, "*Mercury vapor lamps are prohibited. The installation, sale, offering for sale, lease or purchase of any mercury vapor light fixture or lamp for use as outdoor lighting in the County is specifically prohibited.*" Mr. Vanasse stated that although there might be reasons for this to be in here, he did not understand why it would be in the Land Development Code.

Mr. Roberts stated staff debated this because there is also a State Statute that has similar verbiage. Staff opted not to remove it and to leave it in the Land Development Code.

Mr. Vanasse felt that since there are other laws dealing with it, it is redundant. To him, it did not seem to be a "*standard.*" It was more of a notice to merchants.

Mr. Quattrone referred to the new rules of not looking onsite and asked if developers would still be required to model all their onsite lights in the Lighting Plan, particularly flood lights on a building.

Mr. Roberts stated that with flood lights on the building, staff kept the pointing of the flood lights at the architectural features in the same kind of language similar to that, so they are not pointing off site. As far as the uniformity and the foot candle minimums, etc. that used to be required on site, it is no longer required.

Mr. Quattrone stated that sometimes there are situations where someone designed a project, and during construction, they decide to put some flood lights on the building that the developer did not know about. In the past, we would have to do a minor change and a Lighting Plan, etc.

Mr. Roberts stated the lighting features still need to be shown. Staff needs the cut sheet for them.

Mr. Quattrone asked for confirmation that staff still needs the modeling for them.

Mr. Roberts stated that is correct. Staff kept the modeling for it but did not keep the uniformity standards and the minimums.

Mr. Quattrone stated that if we do not have some of those requirements, is it necessary to do a modeling on them.

Mr. Roberts stated that at a minimum, they will need the property line and the 10 foot offset at the property line.

Mr. Vanasse referred to the second line at the top of Page 3 of 15 under Item d. that says, “...no spot or flood luminaire may be aimed, directed, or focused to cause direct light from the luminaire to be directed toward residential buildings on abutting or nearby property...” he asked if the portion that reads, “or focused to cause direct light from the luminaire to be directed toward residential buildings on abutting or nearby property...” could be removed.

Staff made note of this comment.

Mr. Vanasse referred to g. on the same page that says, “All nonessential exterior commercial lighting must be turned off after business hours.” He asked if this language was previously in the Land Development Code.

Mr. Roberts confirmed that this language already existed in the Land Development Code.

Mr. Vanasse asked if the county has ever enforced this in any way.

Mr. Roberts stated he was not aware of this ever being enforced.

Mr. Vanasse stated asked if the county truly wants all businesses that shut down, even in an urban downtown area, to not have lights. He did not understand why this is in the Land Development Code.

Mr. Krise concurred especially since the county does not seem to enforce it. He asked who decides what is “essential.”

Mr. Quattrone stated he has property within the City of Fort Myers, and he leaves his light pole on all night long.

Mr. Roberts stated there was a lot of language in the lighting section that was similar to this that staff removed.

Mr. Vanasse stated that if staff has no strong reason to keep it, he suggested it be removed.

Mr. Quattrone concurred it should be removed especially if it is a condition the county will never enforce.

Mr. Jacob agreed that he did not know how to define “essential,” and that it would depend on who and for what.

Mr. Quattrone referred to Page 4 of 15 (e)(1) that talks about final inspection. He asked if it could be limited to the property line.

Mr. Roberts stated staff can limit it to just at the property line and have the 10 foot offset at the property line because staff is not looking for the on-site.

Mr. Vanasse made a motion to recommend approval of Outdoor Lighting Standards with the comments from the committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Morris. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 7-0.

C. Turn Lane Extension Exemption

Mr. Roberts provided an overview of the amendments and was available for questions.

Mr. Morris asked for confirmation that the added language is intended solely for the circumstance where you have an existing development.

Mr. Roberts stated this particular code section applies to the expansion of existing development and the calculation of trips based on the expansion versus the complete development and how that impacts the turn lane extension.

Mr. Morris stated he had not had a chance to look at the context of 10-288 but noted it was within a larger section of just existing developments.

Mr. Thibaut asked why this decision is not appealable.

Mr. Roberts stated this section was a result of discussions with the Department of Transportation in their right-of-ways and their ability to make decisions about their right-of-way.

Mr. Quattrone asked if it would go to the Hearing Examiner if someone was allowed to appeal it.

Mr. Roberts stated he believed that is where it would be appealed, if allowed.

Ms. Thibaut stated her only issue with this is that the decision is discretionary with no appeal process. She felt it might become a potential due process issue.

Mr. Vanasse stated that typically the county tries to make its codes outline exactly what they want by listing the standards that must be met. However, in this section, the verbiage starts out saying "*Access to streets will not be permitted unless...*" But then some of the verbiage is nebulous such as "*to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public or to reduce adverse traffic impacts.*" To him, it is not clear what that is.

Mr. Roberts stated it is further defined in the Land Development Code and the Administrative Code with the Turn Lane Policy. This is where someone would be able to get more definition with regard to the requirements.

Ms. Thibaut suggested that they make the decision appealable to the Hearing Examiner so that it will not become an issue for the county to where they could be taken to court.

Ms. Thibaut made a motion to recommend approval of the Turn Lane Extension Exemption amendments, but only with the change that there is some process for an appeal to the Hearing Examiner or the Board of County Commissioners. The motion was seconded by Mr. Krise. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 7-0.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – ADJOURNMENT/NEXT MEETING DATE

There was no further discussion.

Ms. Thibaut noted the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 13, 2026, and she adjourned the meeting at 8:58 a.m.