

Rural Fringe Mixed-Use District (RFMUD) Receiving and Neutral Lands: Future Development Potential Public Workshop March 31, 2016



Introduction:

Following three public workshops with the focus of the Sending Areas and the Transfer of Development Rights Credits within the Rural Fringe Mixed-Use District, the objective of the forth workshop was to engage the public in a discussion of the Receiving and Neutral Areas and the development potential within these lands. Approximately 60 residents attended the workshop; about half had not attended any of the previous RFMUD workshops.

To open the meeting, staff presented an overview of the RFMUD plan and process including how development rights are transferred from Sending land to Receiving land. Information was then provided about the development potential of the Neutral and Receiving Areas including how much vacant land was in the different areas, and the allowed land uses, density and intensity. The participants were asked to discuss the information and provide feedback on several questions about the development potential.

Meeting Summary:

Kris Van Lengen, Collier County Planning Manager, addressed the attendees, noting the Board of County Commissioners has directed Staff to develop changes to the Growth Management Plan including the Rural

Fringe Mixed Use District (RFMUD). The purpose of the meeting, the first of at least two Receiving focused meetings, is to look at the current rules and regulations of areas where TDR credits can be sent. Particular emphasis is on design and functionality of these areas in the context of the greater geographic area, including neutral and sending areas, as well as Golden Gate Estates and the Rural Lands Stewardship Areas.

Mr. Van Lengen reviewed the scope of all four upcoming restudies, the process diagram indicating steps necessary to complete Comprehensive Plan changes, the role of the Growth Management Oversight Committee, historic goals of the Rural Fringe Mixed Use District, the outcomes of the first three meetings in 2016 involving Sending Land Issues and a timeline indicating a goal for September submission of conceptual changes to the Board of County Commissioners in advance of the formal Hearing process during 2017.

Anita Jenkins, Collier County Principle Planner, presented a Power Point on Future Development Potential in Neutral and Receiving areas under current rules:

- A review of the TDR exchange program
- Density allowed before and after the program was first adopted over 10 years ago, when only agricultural zoning was in place.
- 40 acres in Receiving areas are required prior to any increase in density via TDRs.
- Uses allowed within the new designation of neutral, receiving and Village were illustrated- some uses are voluntary; some encouraged, some required.
- Open space and transportation components of development were discussed.
- An illustration of nine developments that have redeemed TDRs for increased density was presented.
- Acreage and number of parcels for un-entitled land was presented to provide a sense of scale and potential for future development scenarios in Receiving areas.
- Similar background was provided to show the quantities of Neutral Land in the program.

Following Ms. Jenkins presentation, general remarks were made by attendees and scribed as follows:

- Open space integration
- How to regulate policy
- Is there enough land to make a village? 100-200 Acres more ideal?
- Village Regulation: Economic vitality
- Opportunity to do something different
- Private development dedication
- Demographic and economic inclusion
- Job creation
- Village Acreage: 200acres
- Mix-use development
- Proximity to urban area

Greg Ault, Collier County consultant with AECOM, introduced a visioning session intended to engage workshop participants in discussing potential development and it's form and function. Participants were invited to discuss four questions with small groups, approximately 6 to 12 persons each. The majority of participants were land owners within the RFMUD Receiving areas.

Break out questions with reports from the six groups resulted in the tabulation of responses below:

1. What are the specific issues and/or concerns about the future growth and development of the Receiving Lands Area?

- Not liking it at all
- Feel that support services and goods are close enough
- Economics job creators outside of the Village to include scarce parcels
- Availability of the TDRs and difficulty of acquiring-TDR Bank
- Not much receiving land
- Are we at capacity now? Ten years to build out?
- 70% of land dedication to open space seems excessive
- Travel commute times are increasing
- Additional wildlife crossings are needed
- Fear the minimum of 40 acres will increase to 60 acres
 - Prefer that the acreage minimum decrease instead of increase
- Density increase
- TDR limits development
- No workforce or low-income housing available
- No balance/variety in community design
- The existing program caters to large developments, not to owners with small amounts of acreage
- This program is not meeting the base unit development for Collier County
- There is currently no benefit for properties in the base rights category of 1-5 acres
- Process for public input: essential services such as utilities, fire, schools, shopping
- Roadway capacity: concerns (increase network “connectivity”)
- Utility access
- Quality of Life amenities
- More than houses
- Transition Areas
- Increased population
- Compatible uses
- 6L’s area potentially appropriate location for mixed use, business parks, non-residential
- TDR required purchase makes process non-voluntary
- Pricing mechanism: more expensive as time goes on
- Not enough credits or sending areas to purchase
- Retain agricultural uses/rights
- Property appraiser impacts
- Do developers want to buy in the RFMUD

2. What are the improvements/changes you would like to see happen in the Receiving Lands study area?

- Limit gated communities
- TDR bank
- Village regulation re-examined for economic viability
- More density in concentrated area
- Incentives with receiving area development for enviro protection
- New definition of open space for public benefit
- Develop some commercial uses in the east
- Villages would be good but are there 300 acre parcels
- Need more density per parcel

- Villages should be 100 acres or 200 acres
- 20 acre parcels for clustering
- Mixed-use, balance development
- Live, work, play approach
- Private development dedications: parks, streets, etc
- Lack of starter homes, would like workforce housing
- Smart growth- bike/pedestrian community, interconnectivity
- Research/tech development, i.e. ag
- Standalone commercial development
- A defined place or urban core
- Amenities: placement/ integrated
- Walking;/biking safety
- Demographic mix
- Senses/experiences
- Sense of arrival connectivity
- Re-evaluate size of villages using economic modeling/evaluation to determine appropriate village size
- Smaller landowners need to be able to participate in the process, it is currently not happening as well as it should
- More flexibility within the same public hearing process
- Look at “visioning” for larger receiving areas and plan at the larger scale
- Are cost credits appropriate/viable to utilization in receiving lands? If the credits don’t work, we want to be able to get the development we want and need in receiving
- Reducing minimum acreage size to increase density. i.e. 1 unit per 2.5 acres for 5 acre tracts
- Transportation alternatives such as bus/transit
- More thoughtful community design
- TDR bank
- Allow some sending/receiving flexibility to allow worthwhile regional goals
- Bridge access- North Belle Meade (NBM)

3. **What do you like best about the Receiving Lands area?**

- Existing natural conditions
- Low density
- Close community
- Concept of TDRs and trade off of open space versus development
- Chance to do something different than current urban style of development
- Do we increase size limits of village or multiple villages
- Define types of development allowed in each village
- Has the ability to be developed reasonably
- Nothing
- Lower lands have a subtropical climate which provides a better quality of life
- Accessibility on the south end to Miami/Naples (mixed opinion)
- Flexibility: land acreage
- Concentration of development
- Reducing sprawl
- Buffer area
- Keep development (new) to receiving

- Most appropriate area for development
 - Opportunity because of proximity to coastal urban area
 - Transportation corridor in place
4. **Do your same opinions about the Receiving Lands apply to the Neutral Lands?**
- Allow for incentives to develop
 - Re-evaluate neutral lands on a periodic basis
 - No- neutral and receiving lands must stay separate
 - Yes, in reference to “nothing” comment received for question three
 - No response for question four, no knowledge of neutral lands
 - No, concentrate development to receiving
 - Concerned how much sprawl may impact development
 - Neutral lands were designed to be a rural area/lifestyle
 - Leave neutral as is and allow for discussion later

Andrew **Sheppard, Collier County consultant with AECOM**, wrapped up the workshop with a primer on different kinds of development models that are possible in the sub-urban environment. He discussed the economic, environmental and social elements that must be balanced to create sustainable communities. Development must provide a return on investment, but also can allow some job creation through a mix of uses. Environmental factors must balance the natural world and basic resources with human needs of the inhabitants. Social factors start first with health and safety, but include associations through families, churches, businesses and organizations. He defined neighborhoods as a ¼ mile or five minute walk from a center point, noting that Villages can accommodate a number of neighborhoods within. Typically a central space with a unique feature(s) provide identity, structure and meaning. He also highlighted the advantages of a road network, rather than a single main corridor, for preserving walkable and enjoyable places that are more efficient for transportation. Compared to conventional models of development, these newer models provide more open space, social interaction, and health benefits. The attendees were asked to consider how they would like to live in a community, rather than simply asking what it would look like.

At the end of the workshop Mr. Van Lengen noted the next public meeting is scheduled for April 26, 2016 at 6:30pm at the same location. A follow up for participation will be provided, so that viewpoints on the most important elements for community design can be provided by participants.