

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES  
2011 EVALUATION & APPRAISAL REPORT (EAR)**

**Golden Gate Area Master Plan**

**Goals, Objective and Policies:** The entire Master Plan will be revised to reflect the proper formatting for all Goals, Objectives and Policies, as defined below:

**Goal:** General statement defining what the plan will ultimately achieve, typically beginning with “TO” followed by a transitive verb, such as, TO PROTECT or TO ENSURE.

**Objective:** A more specific statement than the stated Goal; describing actions that will help achieve the goal(s), typically beginning with the active verb providing the general direction, such as, “Implement”, “Promote” or “Protect”. Objectives use the term “will” and allow Policies to specifically require an activity with “shall”.

**Policies:** Specific statements that provide directives on how to achieve the objectives and ultimately the Master Plan’s goals, typically beginning with phrases like, “The County shall promote...”, “The County shall continue to...” or “The District shall expand...” or similar phrases. Policies use the terms “may” or “shall” to provide specific direction.

**Goals, Objective and Policies:** The entire Master Plan should be revised to reflect Department name changes, designee changes, renumbering due to objective and/or policy additions and/or deletions, and grammatical changes.

Goal 1 – reformatting; re-state to capture essence of subsequent Objectives and Policies.

Objective 1.1 – reformatting.

Policy 1.1.4 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to re-identify a specific land area and treat it differently in these provisions; then, revise as necessary or retain as written

Policy 1.1.5 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete.

Policy 1.1.6 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete, relocate or reformat.

Policy 1.1.8 – review for accuracy regarding references to maps located elsewhere, Policies found in other GMP Elements, and adoption dates of referenced documents; then, revise as necessary or retain as written.

Policy 1.2.2 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to identify another specific activity able to benefit from alternative financing, and re-emphasize balanced transportation planning efforts – in part or entirely.

Policy 1.2.4 – reformatting.

Objective 1.3 – reformatting.

Policy 1.3.1 – minor revisions to provide new departmental references.

Objective 1.4 – reformatting.

Policy 1.4.1 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to expand to ensure comprehensive and uniform application of LDC.

Goal 2 – reformatting

Objective 2.1 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to re-identify a specific land area and treat it differently in these provisions; then, revise as necessary or retain as written; reformatting.

Policy 2.1.1 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete, as no longer applicable.

Policy 2.1.2 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to re-identify a specific land area and treat it differently in these provisions; then, revise as necessary or retain with minor revision to update terminology.

Policy 2.1.3 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete, as no longer applicable.

Policy 2.1.4 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete, as no longer applicable.

Objective 2.2 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to show remaining efforts following major project completion; reformatting.

Policy 2.2.1 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete, as no longer applicable.

Policy 2.2.2 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete, as no longer applicable; review for accuracy regarding references to LDC or Statutory cites,; then, revise as necessary or retain as written.

Goal 3 – reformatting.

Objective 3.1 – defer consideration of suggested modification to strengthen this Objective and its subsequent Policy, in demonstrating support for reducing VMT and GHG emissions – in part or entirely; reformatting.

Goal 4 – reformatting.

Objective 4.1 – reformatting.

Policy 4.1.1 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task.

Policy 4.1.2 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task.

Policy 4.1.3 – defer consideration of suggested revisions to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task.

Goal 5 – reformatting.

Objective 5.1 – consider minor revision to show use of existing resource; revisions to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task; re-state to capture essence of subsequent Policy; defer consideration of suggested modification to strengthen this Objective and its subsequent Policy, in demonstrating support for reducing VMT and GHG emissions – in part or entirely; reformatting.

Policy 5.1.1 – defer consideration of suggested revision to show use of existing resource; revisions to better support its Objective; reformatting.

Objective 5.2 – minor revision to be more inclusive of jurisdictions under the Plan; reformatting.

Policy 5.2.1 – minor revision for clarity; defer consideration of suggested modification to strengthen this Policy, in demonstrating support for reducing VMT and GHG emissions – in part or entirely; reformatting.

Policy 5.2.2 – revisions to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task; consider minor revision to show use of existing MPO resource; defer consideration of suggested modification to strengthen this Policy, in demonstrating support for reducing VMT and GHG emissions – in part or entirely.

Policy 5.2.3 – minor revision to show remaining efforts following major project completion.

Objective 5.3 – defer consideration of suggested revision to show use of existing resource; reformatting.

Policy 5.3.2 – minor revision to strengthen preservation efforts.

Goal 6 – defer consideration of suggested modification to strengthen this Goal, and its subsequent Objectives and Policies, in demonstrating support for reducing VMT and GHG emissions – in part or entirely; reformatting.

Objective 6.1 – defer consideration of suggested modification to strengthen this Objective and its subsequent Policies, in demonstrating support for reducing VMT and GHG emissions – in part or entirely; revisions to illustrate expanded planning efforts for more mobility options; reformatting.

Policy 6.1.1 – minor revision to illustrate expanded planning efforts; reformatting.

Policy 6.1.2 – minor revision to reflect continuing efforts between agencies.

Objective 6.2 – defer consideration of suggested modification to strengthen this Objective and its subsequent Policies, in demonstrating support for reducing VMT and GHG emissions – in part or entirely; revisions to this Objective and its subsequent Policies addressing development of route alternatives for traffic throughout the Golden Gate area; reformatting.

Policy 6.2.4 – revisions to strengthen the connection with Transportation Policy 7.1 and develop different urban and rural standards and criteria.

Objective 6.3 – revisions to this Objective and its subsequent Policies addressing development of route alternatives for traffic throughout the Golden Gate area; reformatting.

Policy 6.3.1 – defer consideration of suggested revision to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task.

Policy 6.3.2 – minor revision to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task.

Goal 7 – reformatting.

Objective 7.1 – reformatting.

Policy 7.1.3 – revision to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task.

Objective 7.2 – reformatting.

Policy 7.2.1 – minor revision.

Policy 7.2.2 – minor revision to eliminate duplication of activities.

Objective 7.3 – re-state to capture essence of subsequent Policies; defer consideration of suggested modification to strengthen this Objective and its subsequent Policies, in demonstrating support for reducing VMT and GHG emissions – in part or entirely; reformatting.

Policy 7.3.1 – minor revision to illustrate expanded planning efforts.

Policy 7.3.2 – review for accuracy regarding references to adoption dates of referenced documents; then, revise as necessary or retain as written.

Policy 7.3.4 – minor revision to delete mandate to complete a date-specific task.

GGAMP – Assessment of Select Provisions –

Estates – Mixed Use District: Conditional Uses Subdistrict – revision to encompass all essential services uses relevant to the Golden Gate Estates area and expand the referenced zoning district listed to encompass all relevant zoning districts in Golden Gate Estates.

Estates – Commercial District: Randall Boulevard Commercial Subdistrict – revision to replace the term “shopping center” with reference to C-2 uses.

**Assessment of the Successes & Shortcomings  
and Recommendations  
for the Golden Gate Area Master Plan**

**A. Introduction & Background:**

The purpose of the Golden Gate Area Master Plan is defined within its seven Goals (Goal 1 through Goal 7), which read as follows:

**GOAL 1: TO GUIDE LAND USE AND PUBLIC FACILITY DECISION MAKING WHILE BALANCING THE NEED TO PROVIDE BASIC SERVICES WITH NATURAL RESOURCE CONCERNS THROUGH A WELL PLANNED MIX OF COMPATIBLE LAND USES WHICH ENSURE THE HEALTH, SAFETY, WELFARE, AND QUALITY OF LIFE OF THE LOCAL RESIDENTS.**

The Golden Gate Area Master Plan is an “optional element” of the Collier County Growth Management Plan under Section 163.3177(7), Florida Statutes. As such, there are no specific criteria to guide the format and purposes of this Element. The Golden Gate Master Plan was originally developed, as mandated by (1988) Policy 4.1 of the Future land Use Element of the Growth Management Plan.

As currently formatted, this Master Plan Element consists entirely of seven Goals, and their supporting Objectives and Policies. This Goal should be retained, essentially as written. This Goal should be rephrased to improve its formatting as a “goal”, such as, **TO GUIDE LAND USE AND PUBLIC FACILITY DECISION MAKING THROUGH A WELL PLANNED MIX OF COMPATIBLE LAND USES WHICH ENSURE THE HEALTH, SAFETY, WELFARE, AND QUALITY OF LIFE OF THE LOCAL RESIDENTS, WHILE BALANCING THE NEED TO PROVIDE BASIC SERVICES WITH CONCERNS TO PROTECT NATURAL RESOURCES.** *Revise as necessary capture what follows in Objectives and Policies.*

**B. Objectives Analysis:**

**OBJECTIVE 1.1:**

**Unless otherwise permitted in this Master Plan, new or revised uses of land shall be consistent with designations outlined on the Golden Gate Area Future Land Use Map. The Golden Gate Area Future Land Use Map and companion Future Land Use Designations, Districts, and Subdistricts shall be binding on all development orders effective with the adoption of this Master Plan. Standards and permitted uses for Golden Gate Area Future Land Use Districts and Subdistricts are identified in the Land Use Designation Description Section of this Element.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to follow other portions of the Master Plan when considering land use changes and issuing development orders. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, and structurally followed with a Policy or Policies that provide the specific direction.

Policy Relevance:

There are eight (8) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 1.1.4:**

**Overlays and Special Features shall include:**

**A. Southern Golden Gate Estates Natural Resource Protection Overlay**

This Policy should be retained as written.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011).]*

**Policy 1.1.5**

**Conditional Use requests within Golden Gate Estates shall adhere to the guidelines outlined in the Conditional Uses Subdistrict.**

This Policy is not relevant and should be deleted. As with other Districts and Subdistricts, the Conditional Uses Subdistrict itself contains the provisions necessary to regulate conditional uses in the Golden Gate Estates area.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that the Master Plan is structured somewhat differently than the FLUE or the IAMP and the preposition that this Policy is irrelevant may not be entirely accurate. Change to this Policy is untimely and consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 1.1.6**

**To obtain Conditional Use approval, a super majority vote (minimum of 4 votes) by the Board of Zoning Appeals shall be required.**

This Policy reflects the type of provision usually found in regulatory documents, such as the Collier County Land Development Code (LDC), and should be transitioned there. Until such change takes place, this Policy remains relevant and should be retained, but rewritten. This Policy should be restructured to improve its formatting as a provision or regulation, perhaps as part of the Conditional Uses Subdistrict itself.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that the Master Plan is structured somewhat differently than the FLUE or the IAMP. Change to this Policy is untimely and consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 1.1.8:**

The sites containing existing public educational plants and ancillary plants, and the undeveloped sites owned by the Collier County School Board for future public educational plants and ancillary plants, within the GGAMP area, are depicted on the Future Land Use Map Series in the countywide FLUE and on the Public School Facilities Element Map Series, and referenced in FLUE Policy 5.14 and Intergovernmental Coordination Element Policy 1.2.6. All of these sites are subject to the general Interlocal Agreement, adopted on May 15, 2003 by the Collier County School Board and on May 27, 2003 by the Board of County Commissioners, and as subsequently amended and restated, with an effective date of December 2008, and subject to the implementing land development regulations to be adopted; and, shall be subject to the School Board Review (SBR) Interlocal Agreement, adopted on May 15, 2003 by the Collier County School Board and on May 27, 2003 by the Board of County Commissioners, and subject to the implementing land development regulations. All future educational plants and ancillary plants shall be allowed in zoning districts as set forth in FLUE Policy 5.14.

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained as written

**OBJECTIVE 1.2:**

**Ensure public facilities are provided at an acceptable level of service.**

Policy Relevance:

There are four (4) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 1.2.2:**

**The Collier County Transportation Department shall continue to explore alternative financing methods to accelerate paving of lime-rock roads in the Estates.**

This Policy, as presently written, is not entirely relevant. The County's transportation planning for the Estates does not intend to *accelerate* efforts for improving lime-rock roads, but seeks to find a *balance* among all transportation improvements. The County continues to meet levels of service in the Estates in adherence to its improvement schedule and no *acceleration* of improvement activities is necessary – even if additional financing methods are in place. This Objective should be retained, given the *removal of any reference to “accelerate” road-paving activities in the Estates.*

*This Policy should also be expanded to identify another activity for which alternative financing methods should be explored – that is, for the relocation of public utilities located along the edges of rights-of-way, where widening or other road projects so dictate. At present, such relocation projects are financed by gas tax proceeds that could be better used elsewhere, and be made available for paving lime-rock roads or other purposes.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 1.2.4:**

**Due to the continued use of individual septic systems and private wells within a densely platted urban area, the Florida Governmental Utilities Authority, or its successor, is**

**encouraged to expand their sewer and water service area to include all of that area known as Golden Gate City at the earliest possible time.**

This Policy encourages a private utility provider to expand their services to serve all of Golden Gate City. This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, essentially as written. This Policy should be rephrased to improve its formatting as a “policy”.

**OBJECTIVE 1.3:**

**The County shall continue to protect and preserve the valuable natural resources within the Golden Gate area in accordance with the Objectives and Policies contained within Goals 6 and 7 of the Collier County Conservation and Coastal Management Element.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to protect and preserve the natural resources in accordance with the Conservation and Coastal Management Element. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Protect and preserve the valuable natural resources within the Golden Gate area**; followed by a “policy”, such as:

**Policy 1.3.0.1:**

**The County shall protect and preserve natural resources within the Golden Gate area in accordance with the Objectives and Policies contained within Goals 6 and 7 of the Collier County Conservation and Coastal Management Element.**

Policy Relevance:

There is one (1) Policy within this Objective.

**Policy 1.3.1:**

**The Collier County Environmental Services Department shall coordinate its planning and permitting activities within the Golden Gate Area with all other applicable environmental planning, permitting and regulatory agencies to ensure that all Federal, State and local natural resource protection regulations are being enforced.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, essentially as written. The referenced department title should be revised to be current.

**OBJECTIVE 1.4:**

**Through the enforcement of the Land Development Code and the housing and building codes, Collier County shall continue to provide a living environment within the Golden Gate Area, which is aesthetically acceptable and enhances quality of life.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to provide an aesthetically acceptable and quality of life enhancing living environment within the Golden Gate Area. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Provide a living**



environment within the Golden Gate area, which is aesthetically acceptable and enhances the quality of life; followed by a “policy”, such as:

**Policy 1.4.0.1:**

**Collier County shall provide a living environment that is aesthetically acceptable and enhances the quality of life through the enforcement of the Land Development Code and the housing and building codes.**

Policy Relevance:

There is one (1) Policy within this Objective.

**Policy 1.4.1:**

**The County's Code Enforcement Board shall strictly enforce the Land Development Code to control illegal storage of machinery, vehicles, and junk, and the illegal operation of commercial activities within the Golden Gate Area.**

This Policy targets a small set of potential violations, thus implying that only the illegal storage of certain items and illegal operation of business ventures affect the Estates aesthetically or diminish the quality of life. It is more likely, however, that the living environment is effected by other development, uses and activities. This Policy remains relevant nonetheless, and should be expanded to consider other historical and probable enforcement issues.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**GOAL 2: THE COUNTY RECOGNIZES THAT THE SOUTHERN GOLDEN GATE ESTATES PROJECT (SGGE), AS PART OF THE FEDERAL SAVE OUR EVERGLADES PROGRAM, THAT AREA WHICH LIES SOUTH OF STATE ROAD 84 TO US 41, IS AN AREA OF SPECIAL ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY AND IS BIOLOGICALLY AND HYDROLOGICALLY IMPORTANT.**

This Goal includes outdated locational and project references, and should be rephrased to improve its formatting as a “goal”, such as, **TO RECOGNIZE THAT THE AREA WHICH LIES SOUTH OF INTERSTATE 75 (ALLIGATOR ALLEY) TO US 41 (EAST TRAIL) IS AN AREA OF SPECIAL ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY AND IS BIOLOGICALLY AND HYDROLOGICALLY IMPORTANT THROUGH PARTICIPATION IN THE PICAYUNE STRAND RESTORATION PROJECT AS PART OF THE FEDERAL SAVE OUR EVERGLADES PROGRAM.**

**OBJECTIVE 2.1:**

**Public infrastructure improvements shall be guided by the following policies:**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to follow specific Policies in making public infrastructure improvements. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Provide public infrastructure improvements in the area lying**

south of I-75 (Alligator Alley) to US 41 (East Trail) in accordance with the guidance provided by the Picayune Strand Restoration Project; followed by a “policy”, such as:

**Policy 2.0.1.:**

**Collier County shall guide public infrastructure improvements in the Southern Golden Gate Estates area by the following policies.**

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

Policy Relevance:

There are four (4) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 2.1.1:**

**Minimal road maintenance to include traffic signage, right-of-way mowing and road surface patching/grading will continue.**

*This Policy is no longer relevant and should be deleted. SGGE roads were turned over to SFWMD several years ago by the BCC.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 2.1.2:**

**Consistent with the Public Facilities Element, public water and sewer facilities shall not be expanded into SGGE.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, essentially as written. The term “sewer” should be replaced with “wastewater” in accordance with similar revisions made to certain Sub-Elements of the Public Facilities Element.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 2.1.3:**

**Special taxing districts associated with infrastructure improvements shall not be created for or expanded into SGGE.**

*This Objective is no longer relevant and should be deleted. All land in SGGE is owned by the State.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 2.1.4**

**The County shall apply Chapter 28-25, F.A.C., “Boundary and Regulations for the Big Cypress Area of Critical State Concern” to those Golden Gate Estates units located within the Big Cypress Area of Critical State Concern.**

*This Policy is no longer relevant and should be deleted. SGGE lands have been purchased by the State.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**OBJECTIVE 2.2:**

**In order to further its goal of protecting this area of special environmental sensitivity, the County will coordinate with DEP in an effort to assist the State’s acquisition of privately owned property within SGGE to the extent consistent with the recognition of existing private property rights.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective requires the County to coordinate with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection in State efforts to acquire property. *Properties in SGGE have been purchased and this Objective, along with its subsequent Policies, should be revised to reflect what remains of the County’s coordination efforts, or involvement, with the Picayune Strand Restoration Project.* This Objective should also be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Coordinate with the U.S Army Corps of Engineers to protect the area of special environmental sensitivity within SGGE.**

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

Policy Relevance:

There are two (2) Policies within this Objective

**Policy 2.2.1:**

**The County shall direct inquiries and make information available regarding options for the sale or donation of land to the State, or other inquiries regarding acquisition, to the Florida DEP, Bureau of Land Acquisition's designee, as provided by DEP.**

*This Policy is no longer relevant and should be deleted or revised. All land in SGGE has been purchased by the State.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 2.2.2:**

**Collier County shall continue to implement a system for reviewing applications for development in SGGE, which will include the following procedures:**

- A. Notice to the DEP's Bureau of Land Acquisition of the application within 5 days of receipt.**
- B. Notice to the applicant of DEP's acquisition program, the lack of public infrastructure and the proposed restoration program for the area.**
- C. Within the notice of DEP's acquisition program, the applicant shall be encouraged to contact DEP's Bureau of Land Acquisition to determine and negotiate whether DEP intends to purchase the applicant's property at fair market value.**
- D. Prior to the processing of an application for development approval, the applicant shall provide to the County proof of coordination with DEP. Upon execution of a contract for sale, the application shall be placed in abeyance pending completion of the purchase by DEP.**
- E. The County shall review the environmental impacts of the application in order to minimize said impact.**
- F. The County shall apply Section 4.02.14, Development Standards and Regulations for ACSC-ST of the County's Land Development Code or Chapter 28-25, Florida Administrative Code, "Boundary and Regulations for the Big Cypress Area of Critical State Concern", whichever is stricter.**
- G. The County shall provide a maximum review and processing time of 180 days from the date of commencement of the application procedures before any development permits are issued.**

*This Policy is no longer relevant and should be deleted or revised. All land in SGGE is owned by the State and the restoration project is being implemented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that Southern Golden Gate Estates is now part of Picayune Strand State Forest and may now be treated differently in this Master Plan. Consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up*

*again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**GOAL 3: PROVIDE FOR BASIC COMMERCIAL SERVICES FOR PURPOSES OF SERVING THE RURAL NEEDS OF GOLDEN GATE ESTATES RESIDENTS, SHORTENING VEHICULAR TRIPS, AND PRESERVING RURAL CHARACTER.**

This Goal should be rephrased to improve its formatting as a “goal”, such as, **TO PROVIDE FOR BASIC COMMERCIAL SERVICES FOR PURPOSES OF SERVING THE RURAL NEEDS OF GOLDEN GATE ESTATES RESIDENTS, SHORTENING VEHICULAR TRIPS, AND PRESERVING RURAL CHARACTER.**

**OBJECTIVE 3.1:**

**The placement and designation of Neighborhood Centers within Golden Gate Estates shall meet the locational and rural design criteria contained within the Estates Designation, Estates-Mixed Use District, Neighborhood Center Subdistrict of this Golden Gate Area Master Plan Element, of the Collier County Growth Management Plan.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to designate and place Neighborhood Centers in accordance with criteria found in this Master Plan. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Meet the locational and rural design criteria contained within the Estates Designation, Estates-Mixed Use District, Neighborhood Center Subdistrict of this Golden Gate Area Master Plan Element, of the Collier County Growth Management Plan when considering the placement and designation of Neighborhood Centers within Golden Gate Estates.**

Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

*[Public Comment from February 23, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting that commercial development in the interior of the Estates is not consistent with this Master Plan; Interior commercial activities/uses were intended to be small scale/small magnitude, while peripheral commercial activities/uses were intended to be larger in scale and magnitude.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision. Consideration should be given to clarify the differences between the use of the term “rural” and the term “rural residential”.]*

**GOAL 4: COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING EFFORTS WITHIN GOLDEN GATE CITY SHALL SEEK TO PRESERVE AND ENHANCE A MIX OF RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL LAND USES THAT PROVIDES FOR THE BASIC NEEDS OF BOTH THE LOCAL RESIDENTS AND THE RESIDENTS OF THE SURROUNDING AREA.**

This Goal should be rephrased to improve its formatting as a “goal”, such as, **TO PRESERVE AND ENHANCE A MIX OF RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL LAND USES THAT PROVIDES FOR THE BASIC NEEDS OF BOTH THE LOCAL RESIDENTS WITHIN GOLDEN GATE CITY AND THE RESIDENTS OF THE SURROUNDING AREA.**

**OBJECTIVE 4.1:**

**Development and redevelopment within Golden Gate City shall focus on the provision of residential and commercial land uses that meets the needs of the surrounding area.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to provide for residential and commercial land uses that meet the needs of the surrounding area. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Provide for residential and commercial land uses that meet the needs of the surrounding area in the development and redevelopment within Golden Gate City;** followed by a “policy”, such as:

**Policy 4.0.1.:**

**Development and redevelopment within Golden Gate City shall be guided by the residential and commercial needs of the surrounding area.**

Policy Relevance:

There are three (3) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 4.1.1:**

**By 2006, Collier County shall develop an implementation schedule for the creation of a community-planning program for Golden Gate City. The implementation schedule shall take into consideration the following issues:**

- a) **Affordable housing based upon home ownership;**
- b) **Commercial re-vitalization, to include:**
  - i. **Sidewalks**
  - ii. **Traffic calming measures**
  - iii. **Improved street lighting;**
- c) **Neighborhood parks, open space and recreational centers;**
- d) **Crime reduction;**
- e) **Consistent enforcement of land development regulations; and,**
- f) **Improved lighting for streets and parking areas.**

This Policy requires the County to develop a schedule for creating a Golden Gate City community planning program. Although Golden Gate City is part of a decades-old master planned community, this Golden Gate Area Master Plan and of the FLUE, this Policy remains relevant to the extent that it supports a community planning program. *The date reference should be deleted. This Policy should also be re-written to remove the County as the initiating entity mandated with this task.* The private sector has a better understanding of the issues identified and, ability to organize and initiate such a task among these stakeholders.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 4.1.2:**

**By 2006, Collier County shall begin to examine, by holding community meetings, the feasibility of establishing neighborhood-based planning programs within Golden Gate City that focus on the unique or distinct features of the different portions of the community. While focusing on distinct areas within the community, such neighborhood planning efforts as may be established shall not neglect Golden Gate City as a whole.**

This Policy requires the County to determine the feasibility of establishing neighborhood-based planning programs in creating a Golden Gate City community planning program. This Policy remains relevant to the extent that it supports examining optional elements of a community planning program. As with the Policy above, *the date reference should be deleted. This Policy should also be re-written to remove the County as the initiating entity mandated with this task.* The private sector has a better understanding of the “neighborhoods” involved and, ability to organize and initiate such a task among these neighborhoods.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 4.1.3:**

**By 2006, Collier County shall examine the feasibility of crafting land development regulations specific to the Golden Gate City community. Such regulations shall focus on the unique circumstances of this community.**

This Policy requires the County to determine the feasibility of creating Golden Gate City community-specific development regulations. Although Golden Gate City is part of a decades-old master planned community and platted Subdivision, this Golden Gate Area Master Plan, the FLUE and the LDC, this Policy remains relevant to the extent that it supports examining aspects of County regulations that may recognize the unique circumstances of the community. As with the Policy above, *the date reference should be deleted. This Policy should also be re-written to remove the County as the initiating entity mandated with this task.* The private sector has a better understanding of the “development regulations” that may be cause for retaining this Policy and, ability to organize and initiate such a task – perhaps as part of the undertaking described in Policies 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 above.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**GOAL 5: FUTURE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT WITHIN GOLDEN GATE ESTATES WILL BALANCE THE DESIRE BY RESIDENTS FOR URBAN AMENITIES WITH THE PRESERVATION OF THE AREA'S RURAL CHARACTER, AS DEFINED BY WOODED LOTS, THE KEEPING OF LIVESTOCK, THE ABILITY TO GROW CROPS, WILDLIFE ACTIVITY, LOW-DENSITY**

## RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, AND LIMITATIONS ON COMMERCIAL AND CONDITIONAL USES.

This Goal should be rephrased to improve its formatting as a “goal”, such as, **TO BALANCE THE DESIRE FOR URBAN AMENITIES WITH THE PRESERVATION OF THE AREA’S RURAL CHARACTER, AS DEFINED BY WOODED LOTS, THE KEEPING OF LIVESTOCK, THE ABILITY TO GROW CROPS, WILDLIFE ACTIVITY, LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, AND LIMITATIONS ON COMMERCIAL AND CONDITIONAL USES.**

### OBJECTIVE 5.1:

**By 2006, the Collier County Land Development Code shall be amended to provide for new commercial development within Neighborhood Centers.**

#### Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to amend the LDC to allow commercial development in Neighborhood Centers located in Golden Gates Estates. LDC provisions allow for commercial development in these Neighborhood Centers. Any restudy efforts of the Golden Gate Area Master Plan undertaken in the future should pursue specific studies to ensure any new commercial land uses considered are consistent with the Goals and Objectives of this Master Plan to preserve the area’s rural character.

In determining whether new commercial uses are appropriate or inappropriate and whether the desired rural characteristics may be compromised or diminished, the County should refer to Toward Better Places - The Community Character Plan for Collier County, Florida. The Community Character Plan provides the County with a policy document featuring the most useful aspects of traditional neighborhood design (TND), smart growth, new urbanism and other contemporary planning practices. Objective 7 and its Policies 7.1 through 7.7, of the Future Land Use Element (FLUE) were approved on October 26, 2004 by the Board of County Commissioners in early efforts to incorporate certain “Smart Growth” provisions into the FLUE. The Community Character Plan is a more valuable resource however, and stands to provide the relevant information and useful direction needed to preserve the Golden Gate Estates area’s rural character.

Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

This Objective should be revised to *identify The Community Character Plan as a resource and to consider making full use of it in future planning efforts in the Golden Gate Estates area*, and rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”.

*[Public Comment from February 23, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting that commercial development in the interior of the Estates [outside of this context] is not consistent with this Master Plan; Interior commercial activities/uses were intended to be small scale/small magnitude, while peripheral commercial activities/uses were intended to be larger in scale and magnitude.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should*



*be removed from the/ as a proposed revision. Consideration should be given to clarify the differences between the use of the term "rural" and the term "rural residential".]*

Policy Relevance:

There is a single (1) Policy within this Objective.

**Policy 5.1.1:**

**Consistent with public safety requirements, street, recreational and structure lighting within Golden Gate Estates shall be placed, constructed and maintained in such manner as to prevent or reduce light pollution. In implementing this Policy, the County shall apply the following standards:**

- a. **If a streetlight or an area light is required, it shall be of the type specified to protect neighboring properties from direct glare. Area lighting shall be shielded such that direct rays do not pass property lines. Low-pressure sodium lamps are encouraged while halogen type lights are discouraged.**
  1. **Where required, the street lamp shall be of the high pressure sodium type and have a "cobra head with flat bottom" style or be fully shielded so that light is directed only downward. Street lamps shall be mounted on a wood pole at a height and wattage recommended by the appropriate electric utility and as appropriate for a rural area.**
  2. **Parking lot lamps shall be low-pressure sodium type lamps and shall be mounted so that they point downward without direct rays extending past the parking lot, building entrance, walkway, or other area intended to be illuminated.**
- b. **Where lighting of recreational areas is required, such lighting shall be mounted so as to focus illumination on the areas intended to be illuminated, and to limit the amount of light that extends outside of the intended area.**
- c. **This Policy shall not apply to Tract 124 and the north 150 feet of Tract 126, Unit 12, Golden Gate Estates, located in the southwest quadrant of the Wilson and Golden Gate Boulevards Neighborhood Center.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained and should be expanded. This Policy offers LDC-type standards for street, recreational and structure lighting within Golden Gate Estates as the single planning idea for new commercial development within Neighborhood Centers.

*As with Objective 5.1 above, this Policy will benefit from incorporating more of the Community Character Plan as a resource. Any modifications should not negatively affect the exception provided by subsection "c" above.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop -- Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

## **OBJECTIVE 5.2:**

**The provision of public infrastructure shall be balanced with the need to preserve the rural character of Golden Gate Estates.**

### Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to give consideration to the rural character of the Estates in their planning of public infrastructure. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Balance the provision of public infrastructure with the need to preserve the rural character of Golden Gate Estates.**

Because there are both public and private utilities planned or provided in the rural areas of Golden Gate Estates, this Objective could also be revised to affect the planning and provision of all infrastructures.

### Policy Relevance:

There are three (3) policies within this Objective.

#### **Policy 5.2.1:**

**Future road and bridge improvements in Golden Gate Estates shall not only provide for safety and reasonable mobility, but shall also contribute to the rural character of the area. Transportation improvements shall be designed in context with their setting.**

Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, essentially as written. *The fundamental meaning of this Policy is intended to be capital road and bridge improvements, yet this meaning may be misinterpreted from its present format. Add language to clarify.*

*[Public Comment from February 23, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting that future improvements include more bridges to reduce fuel consumption and improve safety; Bridging waterways, in this context, is preferred over widening roads to 4 or 6 lanes to reduce miles traveled.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision. Consideration should be given to clarify the differences between the use of the term “rural” and the term “rural residential”.]*

#### **Policy 5.2.2:**

**The Collier County Parks and Recreation Department shall create a public network of greenway corridors within Golden Gate Estates that interconnects public lands and permanently protected green space. The first segment of greenway shall be in place by 2006. The greenway network shall consist of interconnected trails and paths which allow people to move about the Estates Area by means other than motorized vehicles. All greenways shall be constructed within existing or future public rights-of-way. In creating the greenway network, the County shall not employ eminent domain proceedings.**

This Policy requires the County to develop a network of greenways in the Estates. In planning this network of greenway corridors, the County should refer to Toward Better Places - The Community Character Plan for Collier County, Florida. The Community Character Plan provides the County with a policy document featuring the most useful aspects of traditional neighborhood design (TND), smart growth, new urbanism and other contemporary planning practices. Objective 7 and its Policies 7.1 through 7.7, of the Future Land Use Element (FLUE) were approved on October 26, 2004 by the Board of County Commissioners in early efforts to incorporate certain "Smart Growth" provisions into the FLUE. The Community Character Plan is a more valuable resource however, and stands to provide the relevant information and useful direction needed to develop this network of greenways in the Golden Gate Estates area.

*This Policy should be revised to provide a connection with the MPO in these planning efforts, and to ensure consistency with the MPO's Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan. Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.*

This Policy should be revised to *identify The Community Character Plan as a resource and to consider making full use of it in future planning efforts in the Golden Gate Estates area*. This Policy should also be revised to *identify entirely different, or additional, County entities* that may be more suited to carrying out such a program – by another chosen date.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 5.2.3:**

**Recognizing the existing residential nature of the land uses surrounding the planned I-75 interchange at Golden Gate Parkway, as well as the restrictions on conditional uses of the Conditional Uses Subdistrict of the Golden Gate Area Master Plan, there shall be no further commercial zoning for properties abutting Golden Gate Parkway between Livingston Road and Santa Barbara Boulevard. No new commercial uses shall be permitted on properties abutting streets accessing Golden Gate Parkway within the above-defined segment. This Policy shall not apply to that existing portion of the Golden Gate Estates Commercial Infill Subdistrict, which is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Golden Gate Parkway and Santa Barbara Boulevard.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, essentially as written. *The "planned" I-75 interchange is completed and this planning reference should be deleted.*

**OBJECTIVE 5.3:**

**By 2006, the Collier County Land Development Code shall be amended, as necessary, so as to provide for the protection of the rural character of Golden Gate Estates. These provisions shall provide for the preservation of such rural amenities as, but not limited to, wooded lots, the keeping of livestock, and the ability to grow crops, wildlife activity, and low-density residential development.**

### Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective *requires* the County – as a Policy requirement would – to amend the LDC to allow rural amenities in Golden Gates Estates. LDC provisions do this. Any restudy efforts of the Golden Gate Area Master Plan undertaken in the future should pursue specific studies to ensure any rural-type amenities or land uses considered are consistent with the Goals and Objectives of this Master Plan to preserve the area’s rural character.

In determining whether uses are appropriate or inappropriate and whether the desired rural characteristics may be compromised or diminished, the County should refer to Toward Better Places - The Community Character Plan for Collier County, Florida. The Community Character Plan provides the County with a policy document featuring the most useful aspects of traditional neighborhood design (TND), smart growth, new urbanism and other contemporary planning practices. Objective 7 and its Policies 7.1 through 7.7, of the Future Land Use Element (FLUE) were approved on October 26, 2004 by the Board of County Commissioners in early efforts to incorporate certain “Smart Growth” provisions into the FLUE. The Community Character Plan is a more valuable resource however, and stands to provide the relevant information and useful direction needed to preserve the Golden Gate Estates area’s rural character.

This Objective should be revised to *identify The Community Character Plan as a resource and to consider making full use of it in future planning efforts in the Golden Gate Estates area*, and rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision. Consideration should be given to clarify the differences between the use of the term “rural” and the term “rural residential”.]*

### Policy Relevance:

There are two (2) policies within this Objective.

#### **Policy 5.3.2:**

**The Land Development Code shall continue to allow the preservation of native vegetation and wildlife indigenous to the Estates Area.**

This Policy is irrelevant and should be strengthened to *encourage* preservation efforts, not just *allow* them.

**GOAL 6: FUTURE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE GOLDEN GATE AREA SHALL PROVIDE FOR A SAFE AND EFFICIENT COUNTY AND LOCAL ROADWAY NETWORK, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME SEEKING TO PRESERVE THE RURAL CHARACTER OF GOLDEN GATE ESTATES.**

The above Goal provides for improving the roadway network throughout the Golden Gate area while preserving its rural characteristics in the Estates areas. Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

This Goal should be rephrased to improve its formatting as a “goal”, such as, **TO PROVIDE FOR A SAFE AND EFFICIENT COUNTY AND LOCAL ROADWAY NETWORK, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME SEEKING TO PRESERVE THE RURAL CHARACTER OF GOLDEN GATE ESTATES, IN FUTURE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE GOLDEN GATE AREA.**

*[Public Comment from February 23, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting that it is preferable, in this context, to divert traffic around the Estates rather than through it.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

#### **OBJECTIVE 6.1:**

**The Collier County Transportation Division will continue to increase the number of route alternatives for traffic moving through the Golden Gate Area in both east-west and north-south directions, consistent with neighborhood traffic safety considerations, and consistent with the preservation of the area’s rural character.**

#### Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective provides for the preservation of the rural character of the Estates and the consideration of neighborhood traffic safety in planning for the improvements to the roadway network throughout the Golden Gate area. *The number of route alternatives for traffic is limited by physical obstacles, fiscal constraints or other impediments, and increases cannot be continued indefinitely.*

*This Objective should be revised to reflect an understanding that limited opportunities for new corridors will not allow a continuing increase in developing alternative routes, while bridges, interconnections and other improvements to existing corridors will provide for the safe and efficient movement of traffic.*

*This Objective should also be expanded to introduce the planning for and development of mass transit and the full spectrum of mobility options. In doing so, the priorities set forth in the below Policies will be reconsidered to reflect a balance among increasing route alternatives, enhancing roadway interconnection and, introducing and enhancing mobility options – all consistent with the preservation of the area’s rural character.*

This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Improve existing routes, develop mobility options, and increase the number of route alternatives for traffic moving through the Golden Gate Area in both east-west and north-south directions, consistent with traffic safety and efficiency considerations, and consistent with the preservation of the area’s rural character.**

Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

*[Public Comment from February 23, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting that it is preferable, in this context, to divert traffic around the Estates rather than through it.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision. Consideration should be given to clarify the differences between the use of the term “rural” and the term “rural residential”.]*

Policy Relevance:

There are two (2) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 6.1.1:**

**In planning to increase the number of route alternatives through the Estates Area, the Collier County Transportation Division will prioritize the following routes over other alternatives:**

- a. **The extension of Vanderbilt Beach Road from its current terminus to DeSoto Boulevard.**
- b. **The development of a north-south connection from the eastern terminus of White Boulevard to Golden Gate Boulevard.**
- c. **The development of a new east-west roadway crossing the Estates Area south of Golden Gate Boulevard.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, essentially as written. Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697. *Additional route alternatives are planned in Golden Gate Estates by the **East of 951 Bridge Program**. The Program should be identified as a new item “d” on the list above. This Policy may be revised to clarify that the a-b-c order of the items listed does not in itself imply the priority of one listing over another. No prioritization is implied or should be inferred from the order of the items listed.*

*[Public Comment from February 23, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting that future improvements include more bridges to reduce fuel consumption and improve safety; Bridging waterways, in this context, is preferred over widening roads to 4 or 6 lanes to reduce miles traveled.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 6.1.2:**

**Collier County shall coordinate with the Florida Department of Transportation to initiate a study of a potential interchange in the vicinity of I-75 and Everglades Boulevard.**

*Coordination between the County and FDOT are ongoing for these purposes. This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, but re-written to reflect the ongoing nature of these coordinated planning efforts, such as, **The County shall to continue to coordinate with the Florida Department of Transportation to implement a study of a potential interchange in the vicinity of I-75 and Everglades Boulevard.***

*[Public Comment from February 23, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting the I-75 interchange should not route traffic through the Estates.]*

**OBJECTIVE 6.2:**

**For the purpose of limiting traffic on arterials and major collectors within Golden Gate Estates, shortening vehicular trips, and increasing overall road system capacity, the County will actively work to increase linkages within the local road system.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective provides for increasing the linkages, or route alternatives, for traffic throughout the Golden Gate area. Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Increase linkages within the local road system for the purposes of limiting traffic on arterials and major collectors within Golden Gate Estates, shortening vehicular trips, and increasing overall road system capacity.**

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from December 7, 2010 EAR Adoption Hearing – Recommending this Objective and its subsequent Policies be modified to recognize and develop linkages through an enhanced grid street pattern and an improved street network with new bridge connections.]*

Policy Relevance:

There are three (3) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 6.2.2:**

**Planning and right-of-way acquisition for bridges within the Estates Area local road system shall make adequate provision for sidewalks and bike lanes.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, essentially as written. Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 6.2.3:**

**Sidewalks and bike lanes shall provide access to government facilities, schools, commercial areas and the planned County greenway network.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained, essentially as written. Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

**Policy 6.2.4:**

**Collier County shall apply the standards and criteria of the Access Management Policy as adopted by Resolution and as may be amended to ensure the protection of the arterial and collector system's capacity and integrity.**

*In addition, this Policy may be modified to indicate whether the greater Golden Gate area needs an Access Management Overlay, giving special considerations to commercial intersections.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from December 7, 2010 EAR Adoption Hearing – Recognizing this Policy's connection with Transportation Element Policy 7.1, and emphasizing the importance of distinguishing between [and developing different] "rural" and "urban" standards for ingress and egress, and for traffic circulation.]*

**OBJECTIVE 6.3:**

**In planning and constructing road improvements within Golden Gate Estates and Golden Gate City, Collier County shall coordinate with local emergency services officials to ensure that the access needs of fire department, police and emergency management personnel and vehicles are met.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective provides for the coordination with emergency services agencies in planning for the improvements to the roadway network throughout the Golden Gate area.

This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an "objective", such as, **Coordinate with local emergency services officials in planning and constructing road improvements within Golden Gate Estates and Golden Gate City to ensure that the access needs of fire department, police and emergency management personnel and vehicles are met.**

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from December 7, 2010 EAR Adoption Hearing – Recommending this Objective and its subsequent Policies (as with Objective 6.2 above) be modified to recognize and develop linkages through both an enhanced grid street pattern and an improved street network with new bridge connections.]*

Policy Relevance:

There are two (2) policies within this Objective.



**Policy 6.3.1:**

**Beginning in 2005, the Collier County Transportation Planning Department shall hold at least one annual public meeting – with Golden Gate Area emergency services providers and the local civic association in order to ensure that emergency needs are addressed during the acquisition of right-of-way for design and construction of road improvements.**

This Policy requires the County to meet with emergency service providers and local civic association(s) at least once each year to address emergency services' needs. *The County has not conducted such meetings unless they took place within the context of coordination efforts during the design of specific projects or when departmental resources allowed.* The date stated in this Policy is no longer relevant and should be deleted, while the remainder of this Policy should be retained if *re-written to reflect the limited departmental resources that would allow fewer such meetings, or delete this Policy entirely.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 6.3.2:**

**Beginning in 2005, the Collier County Transportation Planning Department shall coordinate with Golden Gate Area emergency services providers to prioritize necessary road improvements related to emergency evacuation needs.**

This Policy requires the County to meet with emergency service providers to address emergency services' needs in prioritizing road improvements. The date stated in this Policy is no longer relevant and should be deleted, while the remainder of this Policy should be retained if *re-written to indicate this as a 'continuing' coordination effort, and to identify the County agencies that are involved with emergency services related to evacuation needs.*

**GOAL 7: THE LIVES AND PROPERTY OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE GREATER GOLDEN GATE AREA, AS WELL AS THE HEALTH OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, WILL BE PROTECTED THROUGH THE PROVISION OF EMERGENCY SERVICES THAT PREPARE FOR, MITIGATE, AND RESPOND TO, NATURAL AND MANMADE DISASTERS.**

This Goal should be rephrased to improve its formatting as a "goal" , such as, **TO PROTECT THE LIVES AND PROPERTY OF RESIDENTS OF THE GREATER GOLDEN GATE AREA, AS WELL AS THE HEALTH OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, THROUGH THE PROVISION OF EMERGENCY SERVICES THAT PREPARE FOR, MITIGATE, AND RESPOND TO NATURAL AND MANMADE DISASTERS.**

**OBJECTIVE 7.1:**

**The Collier County Bureau of Emergency Services, Collier County Sheriff's Department, Golden Gate Fire Control and Rescue District, and other appropriate agencies, will continue to maintain and implement public information programs to inform residents and visitors of the Greater Golden Gate Area regarding the means to prevent, prepare for, and cope with, disaster situations.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective provides for the protection of residents and the environment by operating public information programs covering disaster situations. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Maintain and implement public information programs through the Collier County Bureau of Emergency Services, Collier County Sheriff’s Department, Golden Gate Fire Control and Rescue District, and other appropriate agencies, to inform residents and visitors of the Greater Golden Gate Area regarding the means to prevent, prepare for, and cope with, disaster situations.**

Policy Relevance:

There are four (4) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 7.1.3:**

**By 2005, the Collier County Community Development and Environmental Services Division shall evaluate the Land Development Code for Golden Gate Estates and shall eliminate any requirements that are found to be inconsistent with acceptable fire prevention standards. This evaluation process shall be coordinated with the Golden Gate Fire Control and Rescue District and the Collier County Bureau of Emergency Services.**

This Policy requires the County to meet with emergency service providers to address fire prevention standards. The date and Department title stated in this Policy are no longer relevant and should be deleted or revised, while the remainder of this Policy should be retained, essentially as written.

**OBJECTIVE 7.2:**

**Capital improvement projects within the Golden Gate Area shall be coordinated with all applicable emergency services providers to ensure that the needs of these entities are included in the overall public project design.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective provides for the protection of residents and the environment by involving emergency service providers in capital improvement project planning. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Ensure that the needs of all applicable emergency services providers are included and coordinated in the overall public project design for capital improvement projects within the Golden Gate Area.**

Policy Relevance:

There are two (2) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 7.2.1:**

**Preparation of Collier County’s annual Schedule of Capital Improvements for projects within the Golden Gate Area shall be coordinated with the Fire Districts, public and private utilities, Emergency Medical Services Department and the Collier County Sheriff’s Department to ensure that public project designs are consistent with the needs of these agencies.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained if *re-written to identify the “planners” or “planning staff” within each of these entities.*

**Policy 7.2.2:**

**The Golden Gate Fire Control and Rescue District, Collier County Emergency Medical Services Department and the Collier County Sheriff’s Department shall receive copies of pre-construction plans for capital improvement projects in the Golden Gate Area and shall be invited to review and comment on plans for the public projects.**

*This Policy remains relevant and should be retained if re-written to indicate how the planners, or the agents or representatives with planning responsibilities, from these entities are, as a matter of practice, “offered” or “shown” copies of pre-construction plans, instead of requiring that every agency listed must “receive” pre-construction plans. Verifying their receipt and possession of these plans is not necessary because the same entities are also invited to review and comment on these plans as they do with Utility Coordination Meetings.*

**OBJECTIVE 7.3:**

**While the County Transportation Planning Department is in the process of developing strategies for the enhancement of roadway interconnection within Golden Gate City and the Estates Area, interim measures to assure interconnection shall be developed.**

Objective Achievement Analysis:

The above Objective provides for the protection of residents and the environment by improving emergency services through the development of roadway interconnection enhancement strategies. This Objective should be rephrased to improve its formatting as an “objective”, such as, **Develop strategies through the County Transportation Planning Section of the Land Development Services Department for the enhancement of roadway interconnection within Golden Gate City and the Estates Area and assure roadway interconnection in these areas through interim measures.**

Consideration should be given to revisions that recognize the importance of reducing VMT and GHG emissions in furtherance of HB 697.

*Policies 7.3.2, 7.3.3 and 7.3.4 below do not clearly follow from Objective 7.3 above. These Policies should be considered for reformatting under a new, more specific Objective, or Objective 7.3 should be expanded to include statements that would logically lead to said Policies.*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

Policy Relevance:

There are four (4) policies within this Objective.

**Policy 7.3.1:**

**By 2006, the Collier County Bureau of Emergency Services, the Collier County Transportation Division, Golden Gate Fire Control and Rescue District, and other appropriate Federal, State or**

local agencies, shall begin establishing one or more of the following routes for emergency evacuation purposes:

- a. An I-75 Interchange at Everglades Boulevard.
- b. Improved emergency access from Everglades Boulevard to I-75.
- c. Construction of a north-south bridge on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, SW, between White Boulevard and Golden Gate Boulevard.

The date stated in this Policy, along with direction to “begin” this task, is no longer relevant and should be deleted, while the remainder of this Policy should be retained if *re-written*. As with Policy 6.1.1 above, *additional route alternatives are planned in Golden Gate Estates by the East of 951 Bridge Program that may be considered for emergency evacuation purposes. The Program should be identified as a new item “d” on the list above. No prioritization is implied or should be inferred from the order of the items listed.*

*[Public Comment from February 23, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting that future improvements include more bridges to reduce fuel consumption and improve safety; Bridging waterways is preferred over widening roads to 4 or 6 lanes to reduce miles traveled.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for any such change should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

**Policy 7.3.2:**

**All new residential structures shall comply with NFPA (National Fire Protection Association, Incorporated) 299 Standard for Protection of Life and Property from Wildfire, 1997 Edition, as adopted by reference in the Florida Fire Code or the most recent edition.**

This Policy remains relevant and should be retained as written.

**Policy 7.3.4:**

**Beginning in 2006, County-owned property within Golden Gate Estates shall be subject to an active, on-going management plan to reduce the damage caused by wildfires originating from County-owned properties.**

The date stated in this Policy is no longer relevant and should be deleted, while the remainder of this Policy should be retained as written.

**INTRODUCE A NEW GOAL, OBJECTIVE AND POLICY TO EMPHASIZE CERTAIN GROUNDWATER PROTECTION ACTIVITIES IN THE ESTATES.**

**GOAL 8: TO PROTECT NATURAL GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AREAS IN THE GREATER GOLDEN GATE AREA FROM ACTIVITIES THAT COULD DEGRADE OR CONTAMINATE THE QUALITY OF GROUND WATER.**

**OBJECTIVE 8.1:**

Identify methods and means to protect natural groundwater aquifer recharge areas from activities with the potential to degrade and/or contaminate the quality of ground water.

**Policy 8.1.1:**

The County shall include the greater Golden Gate Area in its planning efforts for protecting natural groundwater aquifer recharge areas from degradation or contamination.

**CONSIDER INTRODUCING A NEW OBJECTIVE AND SUBSEQUENT POLICY OR POLICIES FOLLOWING FROM THE 2009 ADOPTION OF HB 697.**

*[Public Comment from March 15, 2010 EAR Public Meeting – Suggesting the County should study ideas to target GHG sources – beside transportation, to address a lack of energy efficient plans, to address the need to plan for sea level rise.]*

*[Planning Commission (CCPC) Comment from August 25, 2010 EAR Workshop – Suggesting that consideration for changes related to HB 697 should be deferred until taken up again under a comprehensive re-study of the Master Plan (tentatively scheduled to get underway in 2011) and should be removed from the/ as a proposed revision.]*

## **C. Future Land Use Designation Description – Assessment of Select Provisions**

In addition to the above Assessment of GGAMP Goals, Objectives and Policies, staff provides below an Assessment of select portions of the *Land Use Designation Description Section*.

### **2. ESTATES DESIGNATION**

#### **A. Estates – Mixed Use District**

#### **3. Conditional Uses Subdistrict**

Various types of conditional uses are permitted in the Estates zoning district within the Golden Gate Estates area. In order to control the location and spacing of new conditional uses, one of the following four sets of criteria shall be met:

##### **a) Essential Services Conditional Use Provisions:**

Those Essential Services Conditional Uses, as identified within Section 2.01.03 G. of the Collier County Land Development Code, may be allowed anywhere within the Estates Zoning District, except as prohibited in certain Neighborhood Centers, and are defined as:

- electric or gas generating plants,
- effluent tanks,
- major re-pump stations,
- sewage treatment plants, including percolation ponds,
- hospitals and hospices,
- water aeration or treatment plants,
- governmental facilities (except for those Permitted Uses identified in Section 2.01.03 of the Land Development Code),
- public water supply acquisition, withdrawal, or extraction facilities, and
- public safety service facilities and other similar facilities.

#### **Provision Assessment:**

This provision, in varying iterations, has existed in the GGAMP since its adoption in 1991 and remains appropriate. However, the LDC reference and/or list of uses may not encompass all essential services, e.g. communication towers which are listed in LDC Sec. 2.01.03 G., Sec. 5.05.09, and in various zoning districts. Additionally, the reference to the Estates zoning district fails to capture all zoning districts found in the Golden Gate Estates area, e.g. P, Public Use zoning at Max Hasse Park.

The County recommends revising the LDC reference and/or list of essential services uses to encompass all essential services uses relevant to the Golden Gate Estates area, and expanding the referenced zoning district listed to encompass all relevant zoning districts in Golden Gate Estates and/or adding reference to the Estates Designation.

### **2. ESTATES DESIGNATION**

#### **B. Estates – Commercial District**

#### **3. Randall Boulevard Commercial Subdistrict**

Recognizing the unique development pattern and characteristics of surrounding land uses, the Randall Boulevard Commercial Subdistrict has been designated on the Golden Gate Area Future Land Use Map. The Subdistrict is comprised of the following properties: Tract 71, Golden Gate

Estates, Unit 23; and the East 165 feet of Tract 54, Golden Gate Estates, Unit 23. See Randall Boulevard Commercial Subdistrict Map.

a) The Criteria for the Subdistrict are as follows:

- All commercial development is encouraged to be in the form of a PUD.
- Projects directly abutting Estates zoned property shall provide, at a minimum, a 75-foot buffer of retained native vegetation in which no parking or water management uses are permitted; except that, when abutting conditional uses no such buffer is required.
- Shared parking shall be required with adjoining developments whenever possible.

b) Limitation of Uses - Uses shall be limited to the following:

- Automobile Service Station;
- Barber & Beauty Shops;
- Convenience Stores;
- Drug Stores;
- Food Markets;
- Hardware Stores;
- Laundries - Self Service Only;
- Post Offices and Professional Offices;
- Repair Shops - Radio, TV, Small Appliances and Shoes;
- Restaurants, including fast food restaurants but not drive-in restaurants
- Shopping Center;
- Veterinary Clinics with no outside kenneling.

Provision Assessment:

The specific list of uses in this subdistrict has existed in the GGAMP since its adoption in 1991 and was taken from a PUD approved prior to 1991. On April 14, 2009, the BCC approved an Appeal of a Zoning Verification Letter (Resolution 2009-99) having the effect of allowing all uses of the C-2 zoning district in the LDC at that time, under the term "shopping center."

The County recommends replacing the term "shopping center" with reference to C-2 uses (perhaps, "All Permitted Uses of the C-2, Convenience Commercial, zoning district in the Collier County Land Development Code, Ordinance 04-41, as amended, as of April 14, 2009").