



## RURAL FRINGE MIXED-USE DISTRICT REVIEW



### CONSERVANCY OF SOUTHWEST FLORIDA AND 1000 FRIENDS OF FLORIDA RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AS PART OF THE COUNTY REVIEW PROCESS JULY, 2015

#### **RECOMMENDATION: REEVALUATE THE CURRENT STRUCTURE OF THE TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (TDR) POLICIES**

##### ACTION ITEMS:

- Calculate the number of severed TDRs, unsevered TDRs and how much additional development these remaining unsevered TDRs could generate.
- Calculate the amount of Receiving Lands that have yet to be entitled.
- In order to better understand what opportunities exist for severance of remaining TDRs, analyze not only the number and size of Sending Lands parcels with unsevered credits, but also identify how many of these parcels are owned by a single entity, what the total acreage for each owner is and where those parcels are in relationship to each other. Such analysis will provide the necessary understanding as to the true ownership composition within the Sending Lands.
- Based on the above evaluation, assess the functionality of each current TDR that can be generated, in order to determine if modifications to the existing system are warranted. For example, if there is currently no public agency willing to accept Sending Lands, should there be the opportunity for landowners to generate a 4<sup>th</sup> TDR in another way?
- If additional TDRs are found to be required to achieve the desired build-out of the Receiving Lands, the County should identify, based on the ownership patterns within the Sending Lands, what additional TDRs might be appropriate for increasing the incentive to participate.
- If additional TDRs are recommended, the total amount of the existing and proposed new TDRs should be calculated, along with the amount of development they could generate, and included in the Comp Plan.
- Identify desired non-residential uses for the Receiving Lands, and create mechanisms to equated TDRs to such non-residential uses.
- Explore the benefit of creating a County TDR Bank which would allow the County to acquire TDRs, place them in the bank and make them available for

landowners in the Receiving Lands to purchase. However, only TDRs that are in the bank should be allowed to be purchased – no selling of TDR futures where the County receives payment and *then* has to try and find a willing TDR seller.

- Consider elimination of the \$25,000 minimum price for the first TDR.

**RECOMMENDATION: CREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY IN DESIGNING MIXED-USE PROJECTS WITHIN THE RECEIVING LANDS**

ACTION ITEMS:

- Review current GMP and LDC policies establishing design standards for Rural Villages to identify which GMP policies are still relevant but may be more appropriate for relocation to the LDC.
- Identify those Rural Village design standards that are necessary to retain in the GMP and/or LDC, and for those deemed unnecessary, consider removal.
- Create new policies that provide flexibility for applicants to design mixed-use projects within the Receiving Lands, consistent with all environmental, infrastructure and neighborhood compatibility policies.
- As additional flexibility in the design standards is contemplated, ensure that the current public hearing process for approval of new development within the RFMUD is retained, as public hearings allow the community the opportunity to provide input and allow applicants to work with the community on project improvements to alleviate concerns.
- Initiate a County-led “visioning” exercise to identify how the RFMUD Receiving Lands could be optimized to provide opportunities for economic diversification, while also meeting local needs, such as providing shopping and employment for residents of Golden Gate Estates.

**RECOMMENDATION: REEXAMINE THE FUTURE ROAD NETWORK WITHIN THE RFMUD \***

ACTION ITEMS:

- Identify appropriate areas for relocating road extensions and expansions within the RFMUD that are inconsistent with the intent of the program due to location within or proximate to Sending and NRPA Sending Lands.
- Create policies and protocols requiring County-identified road corridors to be reviewed in their entirety by permitting agencies, instead of the current practice to piecemeal the projects by having developments within the corridor include a portion of the road within their individual permits.
- Create a rural design for the RFMUD road network that retains the rural character of the area.

## **RECOMMENDATION: SYNERGY WITH SURROUNDING PLANNING AREAS**

### ACTION ITEMS:

- Identify mechanisms for creating synergy between the RFMUD and other adjacent planning areas, especially Golden Gate Estates.
- Coordinate the timing of RFMUD review with review of the Golden Gate Estates Area Master Plan to allow for exploration of mutually beneficial opportunities between the two planning areas.

## **RECOMMENDATION: DESIGN THE RFMUD REVIEW PROCESS TO ENSURE MAXIMUM PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

### ACTION ITEMS:

- Assign the RFMUD review process to County staff, as opposed to outsourcing.
- The Board of County Commissioners has established the framework for the review of all four Eastern Collier Planning Areas, which will entail extensive public workshops and an Oversight Committee. In order to ensure that all interested stakeholders have an equal seat at the table, the substantive policy recommendations should be made by these stakeholders, working with staff through the workshop process. We suggest that workshops be held on a regular basis, perhaps monthly, where staff would provide information and the public would participate, share ideas and provide feedback.

If you have questions regarding these recommendations, please contact Nicole Johnson from the Conservancy at (239) 403-4220, [nicolej@conservancy.org](mailto:nicolej@conservancy.org) or Charles Pattison from 1000 Friends of Florida at (850) 222-6277 x. 103, [cpattison@1000fof.org](mailto:cpattison@1000fof.org).

---

\*In addition to the above recommendations submitted jointly by 1000 Friends of Florida and the Conservancy, below are two additional Conservancy recommendations:

- Reevaluate the proposed Wilson Boulevard Extension to determine if it is needed. If so, consider a less environmentally impactful and more financially feasible road corridor.
- Reevaluate the necessity of the Benfield Road Extension and, if a road in that area is deemed necessary, identify other alternatives that avoid sensitive environmental areas.