

January 7, 2020

MINUTES OF THE COLLIER COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
SUBCOMMITTEE

Naples, Florida, January 7, 2020

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, the Collier County Development Services Advisory Committee – Land Development Review Subcommittee in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 2:00 PM in REGULAR SESSION at the Growth Management Department Building, Room 609/610 2800 N. Horseshoe Drive, Naples, FL with the following persons present:

Chairman: Clay Brooker
Blair Foley (Excused)
Robert Mulhere (Excused)
Jeff Curl (Excused)
Mark McLean

ALSO PRESENT: Jeremy Frantz, LDC Manager
Ellen Summers, Senior Planner
Richard Henderlong, Principal Planner
Eric Johnson, Principal Planner

Any persons in need of the verbatim record of the meeting may request a copy of the audio recording from the Collier County Growth Management Division – Planning and Regulation Building.

1. Call to order

Chairman Brooker called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. and a quorum could not be established. He noted the purpose of the meeting will be to continue review of the proposed amendments as presented by Staff. No actions will be taken by the Subcommittee.

2. Approve agenda

There were no changes to the Agenda.

3. Old Business

a. Golden Gate Parkway Overlay District (GGPOD)

- LDC Sections to be Amended:**
- 1.08.01 Abbreviations DSAC-LDR 12-17-2019
 - 2.03.07 Overlay Zoning Districts
 - 2.05.01 Density Standards and Housing Types
 - 4.02.26 Golden Gate Parkway Activity Center Overlay (GGPACO) Building, Development, and Site Design Standards
 - 4.02.37 Design Standards for Development in the Golden Gate Downtown Center Commercial Overlay District (GGDCCO)
 - 5.05.01 Businesses Serving Alcoholic Beverages
 - 5.06.02 Development Standards for Signs within Residential Districts
 - 10.03.06 Public Notice and Required Hearings for Land Use Petitions

The LDC amendment (LDCA) serves to implement several policies of the recently adopted Golden Gate Area Master Plan (GGAMP) by creating the Golden Gate Parkway Overlay District (GGPOD). The GGPOD will be comprised of two new subdistricts - the Activity Center subdistrict (GGPODAC) and the Downtown subdistrict (GGPOD-DT). The GGPOD will supersede the provisions of the Golden Gate Downtown Center Overlay District and the Golden Gate Parkway Professional Office Commercial Overlay.

Mr. Johnson presented the proposed amendment and distributed an updated version of the GGPOD to the Subcommittee.

Chairman Brooker noted the review is a continuation from the December 17, 2019 meeting. The Subcommittee reviewed the proposed amendment by Section with discussion on the items:

Section 2.03.07 F.2.b – Members sought clarification on how the standards would be applied given a property owner is allowed to utilize the property as prescribed in the underlying zoning or the newly proposed overlay zone. After much discussion, staff clarified that the regulations are intended to allow the uses from the underlying zoning district so as to not take away any private property rights, but to allow the new uses proposed by the GGPOD; however, in either instance, the new development standards proposed in LDC section 4.02.26 shall apply to all properties within the GGPOD.

Section 2.03.07 F.5.a – The proposed GGPOD is comprised of two subdistricts an “Activity Center” in middle of the overlay and a “Downtown subdistrict” located on the east and west ends of the overlay. The intent is for the Activity Center is to promote uses that are more intense and denser than those allowed in the downtown subdistricts as indicated in Table 1 of Section

2.03.07 F.6. – Mr. Frantz indicated that those uses, labeled employment uses, consist of several uses that come from the State of Florida’s Qualified Targeted Industries list. *The Subcommittee noted the terms “Activity Center” and “Downtown District” may want to be included in the definitions.*

Section 2.03.07 F.6 – Table 1 (Business Services) – Staff to review the categories to clarify if other business services are permitted as code number 7374 appears to be a subsection within the

identified list. Staff presented a digital version to the DSAC-LDR, showing changes to the Table, including but not limited to the elimination of Note #5 - restrictions related to escort services, steam baths, and Turkish bath as well as striking out the term “advanced manufacturing,” in favor of having a note at the bottom of the table referencing the “performance standards” in LDC section 4.02.26 D. Consideration may want to be given to distinguishing the types of services allowed in the Activity Center and Downtown subdistricts given the goals for each area and the different existing characteristics of the subdistricts.

Section 2.05.01 A. – Staff changed the text to indicate per “the Golden Gate City Sub-Element of the GGAMP.”

Section 4.02.26 A.1 – Staff to change the wording “...and these regulations.” to “... *and these design standards.*”

Section 4.02.26 A.2. - Staff to change the wording “...Section 5.03.02 H is exempt for properties ...” to “Section 5.03.02 H *does not apply to properties...*”

Section 4.02.26 B.1 – change the word “developments” to “*development*”

Section 4.02.26 B.1 Table – Discussion occurred on allowing 100 percent building coverage and whether any green space should be required. Staff noted the concept is to develop a downtown district with zero lot lines. The development will be subject to stormwater treatment requirements. When questioned if it would be more appropriate for the affected/impacted property owners to opine on the Overlay before DSAC-LDR gets involved, staff noted that the advisory committee for this area has not been established yet; however, the County did conduct two public outreach meetings to obtain input Staff received feedback about building height and character of development. Staff reminded the DSAC-LDR that the GGPOD is located within an economic development zone.

Section 4.02.26 B.1 – Footnote #2 (lines 3-4) – Re-evaluate the term “*extended sidewalk*” to ensure dual sidewalks are not created to serve the buildings. In these instances, planting/seating areas or hardscapes should be incorporated as a treatment and clarified in the Section as necessary.

Section 4.02.26 B.1 – Footnote #2 (line 4) – Discussion occurred on concerns for allowing a balcony to overhang into a right of way. *Staff to research the concept and provide examples for the Subcommittee’s review.*

Section 4.02.26 B.1 – Footnote #3 - Staff to reword the footnote to better clarify how the alley will designate rear yard of a lot.

Section 4.02.26 B.2 – to read “*Non-residential, mixed-use and multi-family buildings. Non-residential, mixed-use and multi-family buildings in the GGPOD shall comply with the following:*”

Section 4.02.26 B.2.d – Discussion on the rationale for not allowing asphalt shingles on the buildings with Staff noting the concept is to provide a certain consistent appearance to the buildings in the overlay district.

Section 4.02.26 B.2.e – Staff to review language regarding corrugated and metal panels.

Section 4.02.26 B.2.f – Staff to review the language regarding neon tubing, LED tubing, etc. to ensure the terms utilized meet the intended goal of the Section.

Section 4.02.26 B.2.h.ii – Staff to review language and consider height limitations for lighting installed on the top levels of a parking structure.

Section 4.02.26 B.2.h.iii – Staff to review language in reference to the access points at the rear of buildings to ensure it is clear on its intention.

4. New Business

None

5. Public comments

Felipe Arcila, SVN/Kova sought information on the costs of constructing parking structures with the Subcommittee asking which was more expensive to construct, underground parking or structured parking. The DSAC-LDR answered that the costs associated with structured parking ranges between \$12k-\$14k per parking space whereas underground ranges is breaking \$55k per space.

Yaimi Reyes, Here We Grow Daycare, commented that she owns the only child care center between 951 and Santa Barbara. The facility was built in 1985 and currently has nine parking spaces (with 12 employees and 90 kids). They purchased the abutting property with the purpose of expanding their parking area. Ms. Reyes approached the DSAC-LDR at this meeting because she was told that she either had to apply for a conditional use application or wait until the Overlay to be approved. Ms. Reyes informed the DSAC-LDR that she intends to expand the off-street parking area as well as the playground area. The area can be expanded, and if so, she could either wait for the Overlay to be approved or go through the conditional use process. Staff commented that the GGPOD includes proposed language regarding off-street parking, vehicular use, and service area standards. Staff would have to determine if the proposed expansion conforms (or not conforms) to the standards. Staff advised Ms. Reyes that she not make any business decisions based on the discussion at this meeting. The DSAC-LDR advised that she continue monitoring the Overlay to make sure her plan is consistent with it and for her to keep coming to these meetings to voice her opinions. The DSAC-LDR advised that she meet with staff afterwards to assist her with options.

6. Next meeting date

TBD

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by the order of the Chair at 4:07 P.M.

**COLLIER COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE - LAND DEVELOPMENT
REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

Clay Brooker

Clay Brooker, Chairman

These Minutes were approved by the Committee on _____, as presented _____, or as amended _____.