

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida, December 3, 2019

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, that the Collier County Planning Commission, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 5:05 p.m., in SPECIAL SESSION in Building "F" of the Government Complex, East Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Mark Strain, Chairman
Karen Homiak, Vice Chair
Edwin Fryer, Secretary
Karl Fry
Stan Chrzanowski, Environmental
Joe Schmitt, Environmental

ABSENT:

Patrick Dearborn
Tom Eastman, Collier County School Board
Representative

ALSO PRESENT:

Jeremy Frantz, LDC Manager
Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Managing Assistant County Attorney
Sally Ashkar, Assistant County Attorney

PROCEEDINGS

MR. FRANTZ: You have a live mic.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the December 3rd meeting of the Collier County Planning Commission. This is the 5:05 meeting. It's a special meeting for an LDC amendment. All those wishing to -- please rise for Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

Will the secretary please do the roll call.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes, sir.

Mr. Chrzanowski?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Fry?

COMMISSIONER FRY: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I'm here.

Chairman Strain?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Vice Chair Homiak?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Schmitt?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Dearborn?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum of five -- six.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Six.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Six, sorry.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, actually, we've got -- Karl needs to be credited for two nights because he was here last night, too.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: So that's seven.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Does that mean I get two votes?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Let's move on to approval of minutes. We have two sets of minutes that were provided electronically. October 31, does anybody have any changes? If not, is there a motion for approval?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: So moved.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: I have a change.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You have a change, okay. Will you hold on your motion?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: On Page 16, the second place that it says Commissioner Homiak, it should be 30 percent, not 3 percent.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If not, Mr. Fryer.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Same motion.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion to approve. Seconded by?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Joe. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries.
November 7th, same question, anybody have any changes? If not, is there a motion?
COMMISSIONER FRYER: Motion to approve.
COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Motion.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mr. Fryer, Mr. Schmitt. Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.
COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.
COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries, both 6-0.

***That takes us to the only advertised public hearing tonight, and it is a legislative matter, so it will not be -- we will not need disclosures or swearing in.

The advertised public hearing is PL20190002545. It's for the elimination -- eliminating seating limitations and extending hours of operations for restaurants within the golf course and recreational use district located within the Golden Gate City Economic Development Zone.

So with that, Jeremy, we're going to turn it over to you, and we'll go from there.

MR. FRANTZ: Okay. Jeremy Frantz with the Growth Management Department, LDC manager. I have a, hopefully, short presentation, and then we can go to any questions that you might have.

So like you said, we just have the one LDC amendment to review tonight related to restaurant seating and hours of operation in that district.

Just to take you back to where the Board is coming from, give a little bit of context about why we're making this change. Back in October, the Board was setting the goals for an invitation to negotiate related to a public/private partnership for the operation of this property.

You can see several of the goals on the screen now, in particular the goal to develop a public/private partnership to provide golf and entertainment experience; that includes anywhere from 9 to 18 holes of golf, and the next goal, to include other complementary experiential opportunities, such as miniature golf, modern driving range, quality food and beverage services, and community space.

Coming out of this discussion, the Board then directed staff to pursue this amendment to eliminate the seating limitations on restaurants in the golf course zoning district. This is intended to provide flexibility for those that are responding to that invitation to negotiate.

The topic was brought up again on November 12th, which the Board reiterated that staff was directed to modify the restaurant seating limitation but also to extend the hours of operation.

So this is -- the dashed line on the screen, this is the boundary of the Golden Gate City Economic Development Zone. This is an area created in 2018 and has been the impetus for a number of county initiatives related to the renewal and redevelopment of the area. This amendment is playing just a small part in the overall picture for this area.

So looking at the existing language for the golf course and recreational use district, you can see that the permitted uses are pretty limited in the GC district. You can also see the silhouette there on the screen represents

the property that this change would apply to.

And you can see there are also a number of accessory uses in the golf course -- in the GC district. These are uses that would be required to be accessory and incidental to uses that are permitted by right; those uses that were listed on the last screen. In particular, we're looking at No. 4 related to restaurants associated with a golf course.

Additionally, there's a number of conditional uses in the GC district. You can see kind of a wide range of uses, but these would go through the conditional-use process. And here the conditional uses, No. 1, establishes that a restaurant that had a seating capacity of greater than 150 seats would be required to go through this conditional-use process.

So our proposed changes are pretty straightforward -- they're in your packets and on the screen -- to eliminate the seating capacity that would typically apply when it's within the Golden Gate City Economic Development Zone and also to extend the hours of operation to 12 a.m.

And in the conditional uses section as well identifying that the conditional-use process would only be required outside of the Golden Gate City Economic Development Zone.

Just to give a little bit of context or a comparison, we did look at several nearby restaurants, at the total seats that are approved. We didn't go and verify that this is how many seats that they do have, but it gives a picture of what 150 seats might look like.

I just wanted to reiterate a couple of things about what this change does not do. It does not apply to the existing commercial properties that are in that area. I can point that out in just a second. It doesn't allow for a stand-alone restaurant that would not be associated with a golf course. As we're looking at those, that use -- excuse me -- the list of accessory uses, it specifically states that a restaurant associated with a golf course, so this wouldn't allow for one that stands alone without a golf course.

It doesn't change or establish any standards for any of the other uses related to a golf course. We're talking strictly about restaurants. And it doesn't change any of the other development standards that would typically apply to this type of use.

So what does that mean? The standards that are currently in place for amplified sound, your building dimensions, parking requirements, setbacks, required buffers or landscaping, any lighting standards or architectural standards, these are all remaining as they are today; no changes.

You can see our public meeting schedule. When we came and talked about the timing for this meeting, you-all asked to make sure that we held some additional public outreach prior to this meeting. We did that on November 18th. And we are scheduled for our first Board of County Commissioners' meeting on Tuesday, December 10th, next week.

I mentioned we held a public information meeting on November 18th. There were well in excess of 100 people in attendance, and we received quite a wide range of questions and concerns. I've laid them out here, kind of summarized what those concerns were to -- you know, folks wanted to see the continued operation of a golf course on the property. There were quite a lot of questions about what the ultimate plans for the golf course are. There were a lot of concerns about the potential for new commercial uses on the golf course and the compatibility with the established neighborhood. Specifically related to a restaurant, there was concerns about traffic, noise, lighting, and potential infrastructure impacts.

There were also a lot of concerns brought up about the existing commercial businesses in that area. There was one suggestion to include a maximum number of seats for restaurants rather than just eliminating entirely. There was also the suggestion that the potential for a restaurant should be addressed at the time when there is a plan for the property, a more complete plan for the property.

There were a number of questions about, you know, whether other uses would now also be allowed to be open until midnight, and then also potential for impact to some property values.

We also had comment cards available for members of the public. We ran out of those comment cards, so not everyone had the opportunity to fill one out, but of those that did, they had the opportunity to indicate their support, opposition, or whether they were undecided about the potential change. You can see the majority of those responses were in opposition. There were a handful of cards that were in support of the change, but all of

them indicated that that was predicated upon there being golf on the property as well.

So with that, I do have some other slides. I can go over some of those development centers that I mentioned that aren't changing. But other than that, I can open up questions to you all. And it looks like we do have a number of members of the public that probably want to speak. I have a couple of cards -- or sheets filled out, but that's it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And first of all, for the audience, normally we ask our questions first, and we'll do that tonight, and then we go to public speakers. Anybody that's here and everybody that's here will have an opportunity to speak. So whether you filled out a card or not, you'll be able to speak. We're here to hear you.

So with that in mind, I'll turn to the Planning Commission first. Is there questions? I'll go to Stan, then Ned, and then Joe, and Karl.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Not a question, just a comment. Your one slide that showed all the restaurants, I think you may want to make "Senior Tequila" "Señor Tequila." I more an old town, but, you know...

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ned?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: First of all, on the unlimited seating, I can't comprehend why we would not propose some limit to the seating. Could you help me with that?

MR. FRANTZ: We were just given very straightforward direction from the Board to eliminate that. That limitation -- really, there's no maximum on the number of seats that you could have at a restaurant that's accessory to a golf course. It would just be required to go through the conditional-use process to get there if you were over 150 seats.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. My next question is, why didn't -- well, I already know the answer, but I don't think it completely answers the question, and that is, I realize that the Board of County Commissioners directed the preparation of an LDC amendment, but why -- I mean, logically, wouldn't this and shouldn't this, if it's anything at all, be a conditional use?

MR. FRANTZ: It could go through the conditional-use process. There are other potential approval processes that something like this could go through. Staff was given direction to bring an LDC forward. I think a part of that consideration is the timing of this invitation to negotiate, wanting to make it clear that this type of a use is something that, you know, they would be favor -- that the Board would see as favorable.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Let's see. One of the points that the Chairman made showed up in the minutes -- one of the sets of minutes we approved related to, perhaps, an overreach as a result of using the LDC amendment process, which has broad application versus targeted or surgical approach, which the conditional-use permit for this area would have been.

It seems to me logically that -- I understand that the Board of County Commissioners directed you to do something, but it was probably more of a general directive than telling you specifically how it should be accomplished, and I think that the Board of County Commissioners would welcome your expertise in responding in ways that in your judgment would make this more consistent with how things were done in the past.

I see that the golf course borders three sides of residential properties. And so if we were to recommend going forward on this, I would certainly want to see some robust proposals having to do with buffering for noise, for light, and the like.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: See, Ned, I think that's part of the problem. Can we, as part of this LDCA, put site-specific criteria for protection of the public into the Land Development Code for this one golf course within this one area? I mean, have you done that before since you've been doing this or anything like that? That's --

MR. FRANTZ: We could probably include some limitations on -- I mean, it's feasible that something could be written that way. It would depend on what your suggestions are, I think.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So as we boil the evening down, we can -- okay.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: No. No problem.

I guess my count showed 57 residents opposed and five in favor without qualification, and the ones who spoke favorably seem to presuppose that there's going to be some kind of a golf course there, and the ones who appeared to be against it, many of them, wanted a golf course of some kind, but did not want a situation that, in their perception, was overcommercialization, which would bring about, you know, all the negative things that overcommercialization brings.

I have watched proceedings of the Board of County Commissioners to try to get a sense of where they want to be going on this, and it's my understanding that there appears to be a direction given that if this is to be a golf course, if it's to be kept that way, that it needs to be self-sufficient, financially self-sufficient. And so I gather that engaging a contractor who, of course, would need to make a profit and, therefore, would want wide opportunities to have large seating and other accessory uses and activities that may almost be independent of a golf course available to them and, in that way, if I understand correctly, the concept would be that the risk of success or failure would be on the contractor, not the county, and it would not be a cost item to the county if it was successful.

And, I mean, I understand that rationale, and I can see that it needs to be thought about carefully, but I have a question that may or may not have been thought of before. When this was a golf course, was it -- demographically, did it draw mostly from Golden Gate City and nearby areas, or did it draw from the entire county, or do we know?

MR. FRANTZ: Yeah, I can't speak to that. I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. My concern is is that if what is desired is a 12- or 18-hole golf course in the usual configuration without lots of commercial activity, that would involve potentially a cost to the county, and if it's a cost to the county, solely for the benefit of a small segment of the county, it's hard to justify. If there were numbers showing that people from Marco came up and, you know, people all over the county came to use a golf course like this, then, perhaps, an argument can be made that there should be a golf course without the excessive commercialization. But somehow the thing has to pay for itself, wouldn't you agree?

MR. FRANTZ: The Board has made that clear that's a part of their, you know, guiding principle about this public/private partnership. They'd like to see this not be a cost to the county.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Let's see here. So if the county went about this on its own without a contractor to assume the risk and the responsibility, am I correct that there would be a cost to the county?

MR. FRANTZ: I am not a part of that analysis. That is probably more at the County Manager's Office level or maybe the individual commissioners' offices. It wasn't a part of my analysis for the amendment either.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. I'm coming to the end here, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Jeremy, so -- he writes the code, so some of these questions may not be as relevant to him as they would be to us. He's not like an applicant.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Right. Okay. The comments -- I thought your review and your presentation was quite thorough, and I appreciated that. And, let's see. On Page 161 of 253 of the packet, the staff, probably you, Jeremy, pulled together the various comments. And there were, it looked like, maybe 10 or 12 bullet points here starting with the desire to see the golf course maintained, continue to operate for the community's benefit, understood. The third one, concerns about the addition of new commercial uses on the golf course property, I think we've -- I've already talked about that. Compatibility of the new experiential or modern golf experiences with the established neighborhood. Could you say a word about compatibility?

MR. FRANTZ: The concerns that the people expressed were about issues like light, traffic, noise, those types of things. You know, trying to capture all of those comments in one thought.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: The potential nuisance effect of the proposed uses.

MR. FRANTZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Then the suggestion about having a maximum number of seats for restaurants, I've already mentioned that. It just seems obvious to me that we would want to have that if we go forward.

Chairman, that's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Joe, then Karl.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I'll follow up in regards to the issue here. I'll be frank, quite honestly, we're taking a ball-peen hammer and a sledgehammer to solve a very small problem here that should be solved through the conditional-use process.

Our LDC is voluminous, and you know that. And we are making -- we're bypassing all of the public notice and other criteria that would go about in regards to any type of use. And the conditional-use process, we're now just codifying it as a change to the LDC, and it makes it automatic. So I have some real problems with that, so I need to be convinced that this is the right way to go. But you've been directed by the Board, so I understand that.

MR. FRANTZ: I mean, I might also add that I think in the Board's discussion of the potential for attracting some sort of, you know, what they're calling a modern golf experience, it might include something like a restaurant in their analysis of what restaurant sizes look like throughout the county, is that 150 seats is rather small. That's been some of their conversation at the Board meetings. And so I think, you know, they're -- they are considering the potential, you know, for the industry to be a little bit different than what the LDC currently limits it.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Let's drill down into this term "modern golf experience," because you showed a picture of Topgolf, and you really understand what that is.

Another term -- because it's a commercial term. It's Topgolf, but there's others -- Driveshaft. There's others that are very similar.

Commercial-type environment, are you -- is the Board looking -- I don't know, but is the Board looking for that type of applicant to submit for a proposal to convert, quote, the golf course to a modern experience, which is, essentially, a stadium-type driving range with the restaurant and all the other amenities associated with it? Very popular. But, again, is that what they were looking for was that type of company to come in and submit for a proposal to use this property as a golf course? Because that really is not a golf course. That's a driving range. That's a restaurant. That's an entertainment center.

MR. FRANTZ: The Board --

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: You showed a picture of it in here. That's what confuses me.

MR. FRANTZ: Yeah. The Board has talked about some interest in attracting a use like that at some of their board meetings. That's why I've put those examples in there. This is something that they're considering.

The way that language is being changed, it would -- it's really just providing flexibility for whatever those businesses -- those firms that are going to be responding to the invitation to negotiate, it will be up to them to propose something. I'm not involved in that process. I'm not involved with those firms.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I understand, but, of course, you put it in the document, so now it leads me to believe that there's a vision that that type of entertainment center would be proposed. And if it were, why would they not go through a public process or the conditional-use process if they wanted to extend past the 10 p.m. hour?

Because right now we're making it a broad change forever and ever applicable to anybody that wants to be in that area. And that's the intent you got from the Board?

MR. FRANTZ: They've expressed interest in attracting those types of firms. Nothing about the invitation to negotiate suggests that that's the only type of proposal that they're going to, you know, possibly get.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I understand. Have you looked at any other clubhouses? Because almost all of the other -- I can't think of another public golf course. Most of our private golf courses associated with clubhouses that are operated as part of the community certainly can extend beyond the 10 p.m. hour when they're doing events at a golf course, because they're part of the community, but this is essentially a public golf course, and any similarities with any of the other clubhouses out there?

MR. FRANTZ: I did review a number of the PUDs that have golf courses and clubhouses and allow for restaurants associated with those golf courses. I did not find -- I didn't do an exhaustive search through them, but I did probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 to 15 -- looked at 10 to 15 PUDs. None of them had a limitation on the number of seats. They were all just limited to being restaurants that serve the members of the golf course.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Okay. But it is in the LDC that currently they limit, but it isn't applicable to other type of clubs associated with PUDs or communities right now.

MR. FRANTZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Karl, then Karen.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Jeremy, I just want to make sure that I'm understanding the proposition here. There was an article in the paper this morning about this, and it showed concepts like Topgolf, that Joe alluded to. I got the impression, right or wrong, that the goal was to create a self-sustaining partnership that would pay -- you know, basically pay for itself. Keep the golf course running but maybe reduce it from 18 holes down to 12 or so, and maybe with the land from the other six holes create this stadium-type experience or a Topgolf-type experience that created more of a destination; to keep the golf course open as a service to the residents of Collier County, but also create a destination to make sure that it's viable for somebody to come in and develop it.

Is that -- is that a reasonable interpretation?

MR. FRANTZ: That's my understanding, and that's what I tried to describe in the amendment.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Okay. Can you define the term -- I noticed in a couple of places in the presentation -- "restaurant associated with the golf course." What is the definition of "associated with the golf course"? Does that mean on the golf course grounds, or does that mean adjacent to the golf course? I mean, I'm just trying to understand the geographic area that we're talking about here.

MR. FRANTZ: Given that it's in the GC district, it would have to be a restaurant that would be in that district. So if you're looking at that particular golf course, it's --

COMMISSIONER FRY: Within the yellow lines of the golf course.

MR. FRANTZ: So it's all the golf course right now.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Okay. You mentioned the amplified sound standards have not changed. One of the -- one of the two pieces of this was to expand the number of seats that were permitted but also to expand the hours from 10 p.m. to midnight. You said there's no change to the amplified sound standards. Do those standards involve and include hours, restrictive hours? If so, what are those?

MR. FRANTZ: On the screen are -- is the table for the amplified sound, the sound level limits, for both residential and commercial uses. The sound level limits that are allowed drop down after 10 p.m., so that would still be in place.

COMMISSIONER FRY: So you can still have amplified sound in a commercial -- like, a restaurant after 10 p.m., just at a reduced decibel level; is that what I'm reading?

MR. FRANTZ: That's right.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Okay. Well, I -- at this point I look forward to hearing the public input on this to make sense of it all.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Karen.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: I really don't have a question. I just have comments that I'm uncomfortable with this not going through a conditional use, no limit on the seats and the hours. We go through great lengths in everything we do here to limit the hours of any type of business like this next to residential, and we're just -- it's like the opposite of everything we do here, to me, and I think we're going down the wrong path. If this is supposed to be a golf -- inside golf, it looks like a bowling alley kind of thing, you have a sports park. Why wouldn't that go there and stay open at night? It just doesn't make any sense to me.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ladies and gentlemen, please. Go ahead. Anybody else have any questions? I have --

COMMISSIONER FRY: Oh, go ahead, Mark.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: My turn.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Please.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Jeremy, this says, when located within the Golden Gate City Economic Development Zone, and that's that approximately one-square-mile block you've shown in there. Are there any

other golf courses in that area today?

MR. FRANTZ: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So this is really site specific to this golf course?

MR. FRANTZ: That's right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. In the literature that you provided from various golfing entities, I read it closely, and one of them -- and I think it's the one called Pop Stroke, it says, you can eat in our full-service restaurant and bar, or we can bring it right out to you on the course. And then a couple pictures down from that it says, under Big Shots Golf, each tee box comes completely equipped with seating for five to six people and is fully enabled with a state-of-the-art technology system, music, and TVs.

And it says, each tee box is equipped with two screens, one devoted to gaming and the other tuned to a TV channel of the guest's choice. It shows a picture of groups of people, a couple of them out on the open-air golf course high-fiving each other.

Is all this done in silence? I mean, it seems like it's going to be pretty active. And I'm leading to a concern that we're going to say this -- how big is the golf course that we have, that we bought?

MR. FRANTZ: I don't have the acreage off the --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. It's over 100 acres. I think it's 106 or something. Even if it was -- as long as it's over 10 acres, it can be a PUD.

So a PUD, then, could enter into some of the things that I've heard talked about for this property that may or may not be something the residents want, but it has been discussed by various entities.

There's -- talked about getting additional right-of-way to widen 951. That's practical. Talked about having an affordable housing piece of property that could be partnered with someone who will build affordable housing. Talked about having a veterans hospital. That would probably be a pretty sizeable experience. It talked about having it remain an eight-hole (sic) golf course, and now we're talking about a driving and restaurant range.

What's important is we've got a series of ideas for this property, and it's big enough to do a lot of different ideas. If we start dicing this property up, cutting and slicing it and putting a little thing here and a little thing there, before we know it, the master plan is for the whole property that we could do as a PUD and then come in with the compatibility needed for the community, show them the whole program and how it fits, look at the economics of it, and do a complete package.

Is there any -- has anybody suggested doing it that way? Because what you're suggesting here tonight under the golf course setting, just under GC, this restaurant can go anywhere in that GC zoning, and about 80 percent of it seems to be up against existing residential.

And I'm sure that that wasn't the intent, but that's why we don't do site-specific applications in the LDC, because you can't narrow them down, you can't focus them, you can't make them fit, and you can't address the compatibility standards to the extent you can under a conditional use or a PUD.

Now, if we look at the ordinance, No. 2018-56, that was signed in November of 2018, it forms the economic area that this Golden Gate City is now in. And it's supposed to have been -- there's supposed to have been an advisory board appointed with seven members, and they shall be representative of residential, business, and commercial interests in Golden Gate City.

Who are the -- who are the members of this committee; do you know?

MR. FRANTZ: I don't know if that has been created yet. I'm not --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I can fill you in. It hasn't been; it hasn't been. And it started to, and then it stopped for a long period of time, and now I guess maybe being resurrected now, but it says their positions or their responsibilities, functions, including, but not limited to, advising and assisting the Board of County Commissioners in establishment, review, and enhancement of policies and programs to attract businesses or industries to the Golden Gate City Economic Development Zone, reviewing and making recommendations on applications for funding through the trust fund as well as handling any matters that may be assigned for the Board of County Commissioners.

Now, that advisory group would be probably a perfect instrument in which to get an idea like this floated

and looking at the possibilities and options of which for it to go forward. And then if the course is going to be spliced up in different pieces which it, obviously, will have to be in order to make some kind of return on it, those pieces, then, can be looked at for their stand-alone compatibility and coordination of one another as well as the existing neighborhood.

So I don't know why we aren't doing that, and I haven't heard a good reason here tonight. I know that if this was presented by a private party, they wouldn't get too far with this process here tonight. So I don't know why we can't take a step back and do this in a partnership with the community, getting the residents there involved in it instead of kind of a short-cycled process through the county that it's going through now.

Right now, I'm a little concerned that this is heading in a direction this isn't going to have enough follow-through with the community involved. And I'm telling you that because you've -- you did a good job on laying it out, researching it, but since this is a site-specific amendment, I'm real concerned that this is not the right process for it.

And that's all I've got. Joe?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: One follow-up. I'm going to focus again on the -- I'll call it the Topgolf, or there's other names for other companies out there. Has there been any type of zoning verification letter or any other type of indication that if they were to propose something today, that it could be built there under the golf course zoning? Because it really is an entertainment center; it's not a golf course. So I question, even if you get a proposal today, it would even be allowed. Has anybody looked at that?

MR. FRANTZ: I'm not aware of any zoning verification letters that have come in asking that question. I'm going to let Jeff take over.

MR. WILLIG: For the record, Geoff Willig, County Manager's Office.

With this item, the intent is to -- for the ITN to provide some flexibility for the proposals that are coming in. All of those proposals will go to the Board before they're awarded. And so when the Board hears those presentations, they can make those comments on how big, where it goes, and the location of that item through those presentations.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I don't understand the flexibility issue. There is no flexibility. It is golf course zoned right now. In order to come in with that type of entertainment --

MR. WILLIG: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: -- it seems that it would have to go through some type of rezoning to -- or a conditional use or other type, because that is not -- that's an entertainment facility. It's not a golf course.

MR. WILLIG: Right. And we have a --

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: So when you just deal with the thing called a restaurant, it's just a small piece of the entire venue.

MR. WILLIG: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: So I don't -- you're asking for flexibility that is irrelevant, I guess, is the word I'm going to use.

MR. WILLIG: And we also have a planning and engineering firm that's going to be working with us on rezoning the entire site and working through that process for, as Commissioner Strain mentioned, the VA nursing home, the workforce housing, and those components as well.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: All right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But, Geoff, that's exactly how it should be done. Why don't we wait and see where this fits in the best? Because as you get into your design with the veterans hospital, they're very particular about how they locate. In fact, I helped with that experience we had previously when we tried to get them to locate here in Collier County before. So they may have a location or they may finally find a location to fit on here where we could have this facility sitting there right in the middle of it, and then we've got to do what we've had to do with the Pezeshkan property at the triangle is try to buy out the previous vendor to get them off the site so we can move forward with the site like we want it to be. Why don't we just do it right and go through a planned unit -- I would highly suggest a PUD, because then the flexibility and the compatibility and all those standards are there. Why wasn't this committee enacted? Why wasn't it put together?

Do you know? I'm sorry.

MR. WILLIG: I'm sorry. I don't know why that hasn't been done. I was just told that its advertised on our website for members of this committee. So the Board is actively seeking membership for this committee.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I -- one suggestion. Let it grow out a little bit; make it a little bushier. Last time I saw, you didn't have any hair on your face at all, so you're in the right direction.

MR. WILLIG: I'm trying.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Can I ask Geoff a question?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Geoff, may I ask you just a quick question. I'm just curious, Mark's suggestion of a PUD, I think you have a lot of residents that are here that may be concerned because they don't know what they're going to get.

MR. WILLIG: Sure.

COMMISSIONER FRY: It's an unknown commodity, and I'd be concerned as well. Is there -- it seems like the County Commissioners wanted to streamline the process and make it easier for somebody to come in and create an attraction that would draw people. Is there a problem? Is there a show stopper in some way about it coming through in the form of a PUD instead of this very limited --

MR. WILLIG: I'm not sure if there's a problem with that. I just know that their direction to us was to open it up to make it a little easier for vendors to want to bid on this ITN.

COMMISSIONER FRY: With the idea that the BCC would then --

MR. WILLIG: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FRY: -- have the final say and approve it?

MR. WILLIG: Exactly, yes.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Just for scale purposes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: A Topgolf-type facility is 18 to 20 acres for that type of facility.

COMMISSIONER FRY: So that would replace several of the 18 holes, then?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: For the -- that indoor type of driving range that they showed, it's --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's about one-fifth of the size of the land that's there.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yeah. I guess maybe more if you're talking parking. But, basically, 18 to 28.

COMMISSIONER FRY: So it would take three to six out of the 18 holes.

MR. WILLIG: And, Commissioners, I might remind you, currently, there is currently space already on the property for a driving range that was previously existing. So it may take reorganizing of some of the holes or something like that, but there is space already existing for a driving range on this property.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: But understand again, you're talking, at Topgolf you've got 60-foot, 80-foot towers, and that's outdoor lighting. So it's -- again, it's a -- it's an attraction. It's not a driving range where you go out and practice. It's not a practice range.

MR. WILLIG: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: It is everything; practice range plus entertainment center.

MR. WILLIG: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, let's go to public --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Mark?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Stan.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: It sounds like six out of six think this ain't ready for prime time.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I'm not --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Should we keep going?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes, we should. We need to hear the public. That's why they came here tonight. It needs to be on record, because when this goes to the board, they'd like -- they need the package.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So we've got to hear the whole thing. I'm not necessarily against this operation. I'm against the process it's going through, because it doesn't give us a comprehensive way of approaching this project as a whole. That's what we should be doing.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: So you're saying this ain't ready for prime time?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right, but I don't want to cut the public off from speaking tonight.

So, Jeremy, will you --

MR. FASSOLD: Can we take, like, a five-minute recess. We're having technical difficulty in the control room.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Tactical or technical?

MR. FASSOLD: Technical.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Let's just take a break. We'll resume at five minutes -- well, five minutes to 6:00; 5:55.

(A brief recess was had from 5:46 p.m. to 5:55 p.m.)

MR. FRANTZ: You have a live mic.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, when we left off, we were going to go to public speakers, and we're going to start with the registered speakers, and after the registered speakers have their time, we'll turn to anybody else that wants to talk on this matter. So everybody that's here, if you do want to talk, you'll certainly be heard tonight.

Jeremy, would you call the first speaker.

And use either microphone; whatever's most convenient to you. And we do ask you try to limit your discussion to five minutes, although we're not going to cut you off. If it's redundant information or you just agree with the speaker before, you can say that, and that's just as effective.

So go ahead, Jeremy.

MR. FRANTZ: The first slip I have is Robert Sterman.

MR. STERMAN: Hi.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good evening.

MR. STERMAN: Thank you for letting me speak.

I've been a resident --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You'll need to identify yourself for the record with your name.

MR. STERMAN: Robert Sterman, S-t-e-r-m-a-n.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

MR. STERMAN: Yeah, I'm a resident here of Collier County almost over 16 years now and part time over 30. And I've always been golfing at the Golden Gate Golf Course for all those years I've been coming here and now that I'm a resident of the county for several years. And I think they ought to keep the course as a golf course and start with that as the biggest -- the number one issue here.
(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ladies and gentlemen, please. This -- we have to -- everything that's said here is picked up on a recording and, unfortunately, when you clap and make noises from the audience, it does interfere with the recording, and that means our transcriber, if she has to rely on that, can't make it any -- can't make it out clear enough. So we have to ask you to refrain from that. So go ahead, sir.

MR. STERMAN: Yes. I think it should be maintained, priority, and first and foremost as a golf course. We start with that situation first and then work at the other situations they want to add into the golf course.

But the public as far as the people, the residents that live around there and utilize the golf course, that is a big area that is a nice -- it's like a park. It's like any of the parks here in this county that people go and enjoy.

But for the golf course, people go there, they pay to play. Most of the county parks you go to, the

residents don't pay to get into the park. They just go there and utilize it, and the taxpayers pay for that. So why not utilize that golf course as the way it is as an 18-hole golf course and not a 12-hole golf course, like Commissioner Saunders stated? Who has ever heard of a 12-hole golf course?

So my feelings, and a lot of my friends and neighbors, and everyone I golf with, they all feel the same way in this area. This is our area. This will utilize the sports complex you're going to build down there off of Alligator Alley that's been proposed and passed. Also, you're going to have a pickleball court over here in Golden Gate Park. The hotel will utilize the people that come in town for those events and the parents who come here to utilize the sporting complex down the road.

They would have a chance to golf, swim, and to relax here in this county without going very far to utilize that. So -- and, I think -- and plus, my last thing I'd like to say is the density problem. Why do they have to keep building on every square inch of land in this county? If you recall, what happened in Houston with Harvey, when that hit, the planning commissioner told the county commissioners to quit building. And what happened? They had a tempest that landed right on top of them, and three foot of water inundated everybody's community, the multi-wealthy down to the average worker. Everyone was flooded. And he told them years in advance, stop the building.

And this is a perfect place out here for water to drain, for the wildlife, and for the neighbors to enjoy. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, Jeremy.

MR. FRANTZ: The last slip that I have is Ron Jefferson.

MR. JEFFERSON: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Ron Jefferson. I live in the four square of Golden Gate City. I'm the vice president of Golden Gate Area Civic Association.

Speaking on behalf of the Golden Gate Area Civic Association, we're opposed to changing the land management code. We don't want to increase from 150 -- over 150 or increase the hours. And I do have some notes -- a couple comments I'd like to share from Kady Tuff, the president of the Golden Gate Area Civic Association.

And the opportunity zone overlay is required to have a local citizen board to develop the master plan. I believe that's what you were talking about, Mr. Strain. This hasn't been done. We shouldn't piecemeal an item without a master plan for Zone 3.

There were noise problems in the past at the chickee hut, and this is closer than the existing chickee hut. I'm sorry. The Planning Commission said they would never want to create another Stevie Tomatoes that is on Immokalee Road and 951, and this would repeat the action. Apparently, there's been a problem in the past.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes.

MR. JEFFERSON: By county ordinance, a seven-member board is required to oversee the new Golden Gate economic opportunity zone, and that board has yet to be established. I believe that it is premature to be making changes to any uses within this zone, and that was your comment.

In summary, the county staff states that -- uses sought to encourage a family-friendly facility, but what families will be using these services during the requested extended hours of 10 to midnight?

It makes sense that uses chosen for the golf course property are consistent and create a campus that is compatible with the surrounding community, which includes the Pars, a 55-and-over community, single-family residences, and hopefully a veterans nursing facility.

After viewing the nightclub atmosphere of those proposed golf-related facilities, I do not believe that they are compatible.

And we do appreciate everything that the county has done with this. We're glad the county acquired the property. I don't even think that we need to make a decision on consuming all that property. I think if even possible, leave it for green space for future generations to have some type of development there, too. So if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Sir, while you're up here -- and maybe our chairman knows the

answer -- who makes the appointment of the seven-member advisory committee?

MR. JEFFERSON: I believe they have to apply, and they're approved through the County Commission.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Board of County Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you very much, sir.

Now, that's all the registered speakers, so one at a time, is there anybody here that would like to speak in addition to those that have already spoken? Sir, would you please come up to the microphone, identify yourself for the record. We'll be glad to hear you.

And by the way, Ned, the County Commission has to vote for the members, but it has to be with a recommendation from the commissioner of the district if they're going to be outside of the Golden Gate City area.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I see. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sir?

MR. McLEAN: Good evening. My name is Charlie McLean, M-c-L-e-a-n, and I live at what is commonly known to us who live there -- there's a number of people here now -- as The Pars. If you looked at it from an aerial view up above, it is the group of condominiums that is surrounded by the golf course currently.

If you drove into the Pars, you would think we owned the golf course because, typically, as you went to the higher priced places, like --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Excuse me, sir. What is the word you're using again?

MR. McLEAN: Boston accent. The Pars.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. McLEAN: Remember that I drove here in my car, and it's parked right outside.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you very much.

MR. McLEAN: Two things: One about the golf course itself, and I know that isn't the crux of tonight's thing, but just when you said it would get passed on from speaking here, I don't know if any of you are golfers, but if you're not, I'm sure you have friends that are. This golf course was designed back in the '70s for use as women's golf, and at least one of the women's championships was played there at that time. It is still -- if you cross out of your mind the anthills and all the other things that -- because it's been allowed to slip away -- it's a beautiful layout. It may not have the length today of what pros would want, the women's golf or even the men's, but it is more than adequate for the general public with the so-called duffers likes myself.

And as to the affordability coming up with the vendor that might want it, yes, the vendors are shy enough because of the seed money that would be needed, I'm told, and that's understandable that it would be, but the county would have the ability to let them waive some money; in other words, not pay out anything on the county but not maybe return anything from them for X amount of period of time until they could build it up.

The county right now is doing a fantastic job cutting it. If you look at it and you don't walk out onto it, it looks like it's ready to play. The only thing that looks missing is when you look at the greens, there's no flag. But other than that, it looks great until you walk out onto it.

Getting away from that and into the part of the ordinance that you're seeking here approval of, the entertainment complex that you talk about is not enclosed. A lot of it is outside as the gentleman seemed to realize with these multilayer towers of people hitting golf balls. And it's target balls. They collect points by hitting the golf ball into a certain area. They've got to respond.

Today, if you listen to the chickee bar, which is way smaller than what is proposed, if the wind's blowing in the right direction, you can sing along with the songs. That's not lying to you. I wouldn't do that; I'm a retired police officer.

It is true, and what you're allowing is not only later at night -- try to put yourselves in our positions. You're surrounded by the golf course. Midnight to an over-55 community, property values would -- you'd have to take big-time restrictions.

All of us appreciate -- I know I feel a lot better about things tonight after listening to this board speak.

You seem to have our welfare as your concern, and it's much appreciated.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, sir. Does anybody else wish to speak? Sir, come on up. The man in the red shirt first. Then we'll go to the fellow in the back afterwards with the short beard back there.

MR. KAZIMOUR: My name is Jim Kazimour, K-a-z-i-m-o-u-r. I live in The Pars also. I don't have a Boston accent, which reminded me of Cousin Vinny. Hey, youts. You know, the youts. But, anyway.

I'm going to echo -- I know you didn't want us to echo what was already said, but you have an 18-hole golf course that was professionally designed, and it has irrigation. That's huge. I'm not a course superintendent, but I know that that's millions in infrastructure. Why not use it? We'd be on it today if the commissioners wanted us to.

You wrote a guy a check for 23 or 29 million? Write a check for 500,000; get us back on the golf course. In the meantime, make some revenue. We drive -- I drive 30, 40 miles now to play golf reasonably. Come January 1, it won't be reasonable. Put a course there that the average guy can play, and you won't be able to beat people away from that course.

I live in Lake County, Illinois. The county runs four 18-hole golf courses. Beautiful. I guarantee you they're making money. Look it up; Lake County, Illinois, forest preserve district. They're beautiful facilities. I want them to consider that.

Topgolf isn't going to come here. They're going to do a feasibility study. Do you think Topgolf is going to put a million-dollar facility in Golden Gate? Let's be real. Come on.

A golf course will go, because I'll drive 40 guys a week -- we played three times a week, 40 guys, at Golden Gate. Come January 1, you know, I'll spend 3-, \$400 a week on golf, but not one time. And that's what happens after January 1.

Consider that, please. And I know it's not you -- you guys are the planners, but I know the commissioners don't want a golf course. They're doing everything -- I mean, I went to two meetings. A blind man can see that they're opposed to a golf course. A 12-hole course. We're going to put this there. A VA home there. We're going to put affordable housing. Oh, but we're going to give you 12 holes. Be realistic.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. The gentleman in the back, you know, it's all going to turn gray soon.

MR. ECHEVERRI: Oh, yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You need to identify yourself for the record, please.

MR. ECHEVERRI: Thank you for the opportunity to let me speak. My name is Paulo Echeverri, E-c-h-e-v-e-r-r-i. Tough one.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yep.

MR. ECHEVERRI: Okay. I've been living in 44th Street for -- since 2001. And everything at the beginning, the first few years were great. But it seems like the community has been growing and growing. And now the traffic on 44th Street is becoming terrible. Main reason why is they say all the people who live in the Par apartments, it's the only way of access for in and out for the guys who live there. Plus, the community has grown a lot.

Let's say, some newer houses are built in the recent years, and the traffic is becoming worse and worse. Probably just another -- I don't know if this is right place to complain about that, but there are not a single speed limit sign, not a single speed bump.

Kids walk through that street to go to Golden Terrace Elementary. And, I mean, it's becoming dangerous.

In the last year and a half, I have lost my mailbox twice, been hit by car. First time, okay, I fix it. The second time, I call the police. They cannot do anything unless I have a camera recording all day long and all night. It usually happens over nights.

And I mean, it just -- it was perfect living there before. And if this restaurant proposal passes or something, maybe the traffic's going to be worse. So things will be bad, and we're going to lose money on our

property and all that. So that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, as these meetings evolve and this golf course is planned out, assuming it does get planned out, you may want to keep expressing your concerns, because if there's a way in a new plan to look at alternative entrances or multiple entrances for the Par area so that they're not always going out your street but they have another opportunity to go in another direction, that might be something that could come out of that. But that's all part of a master plan that we have not started yet.

MR. ECHEVERRI: I would love to see 44th Street the way, let's say, St. Andrew's Boulevard is, that it have the signs and the speed bumps. 44th Street's tiny. I mean, it's just one lane each direction, and it's really narrow. It's a really narrow street, and cars drive by really fast there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, I'm glad you told us your issues. Maybe we'll get somebody to take a look at it.

MR. ECHEVERRI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Do our best. After the meeting, if you'll hang out for a minute, I'll give you my card.

MR. ECHEVERRI: Unfortunately, I have to leave because my daughter is having a concert right now. She plays the violin, and I'm about to miss it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Don't miss that.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: We're all going to go. Don't miss that.

MR. ECHEVERRI: Okay. I come for next meeting. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there anybody else that wants to speak?

Ma'am, you'll need to identify yourself for the record.

MS. KUNGLE: Jean Kungle. I'm a resident of Collier County. I'm not a resident of the Golden Gate area up there, but I do have a concern with how fast this is kind of running through. It sort of sets a precedent with the county.

We have a lot of other issues that are more important than emergency meetings to put more hours on a restaurant for something that we don't even know what it's going to be yet. Nobody's asked for anything. So I just think that we need to wait. And I think the idea of the PUD is a far better idea.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. Anybody else have any comments they'd like to make? Okay. She's not allowed to speak.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Do I have to fight my way up there?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes, you do. Commissioner, good evening. It's good to see you.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Good evening.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: This is a different position for you, isn't it, after all these years?

COMMISSIONER FIALA: But I like this one better and don't feel quite as much of a target, you know. I've been listening to all of these things, and some of the things I wasn't quite sure -- they were talking about Topgolf, and they were saying something about we gave direction about that, but we never gave any direction about Topgolf. I don't even know what Topgolf is except, you know, Joe, you explained it a little bit.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: It was -- pictures were included in our packet. That's all.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, as examples of what was thought.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: What was -- it just gave the impression that that was part of the -- one of the potential uses; that's all. So I was trying to clarify. I know it didn't come from the Board. It was just --

COMMISSIONER FIALA: I thought somebody else said. And, you know, I feel I'm in the dark a lot about this because I don't really understand what's even going on. I don't understand -- there's been a big rush. We've been waiting almost two years to get the approval to start a management plan for the East Naples area. We still can't even get the approval, and this thing is already going before the Planning Commission, and next Tuesday it's going before us. I was really surprised at how quickly that went.

I'm going to back up just a little bit. You were talking about a golf course and people playing on it and so forth. I moved here in '74, and in '76, I was taking my son in his stroller over to watch a golf course, and it was right there at Golden Gate Golf Course. And it was Bing Crosby playing and his wife playing, and it was all

the TV cameras and everything. Do you remember that? Yes.

And that was -- and it was a beautiful golf course. It was very, very good; very, very popular. And even today somebody else was asking up here, they don't know who else plays on it but Golden Gate people. My goodness, there's a lot of vets going over there a lot of times. And it's a nice place because it isn't quite as expensive. They can go there, and they seem to like it -- well, you know, Ron Cummings, they go there golfing all the time and that group that he hangs around with. And so I think there's a lot of uses for this. And I just hate to see it lost, because we won't ever have an opportunity to have another municipal golf course here in Collier County. That's my feeling about it.

I think -- I have all these notes, but I get nervous.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, Commissioner. Anybody else that would like to speak?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I have a clarification on something I heard, just as a point. Jeremy, there's a height limitation for any structures built on this golf course, isn't there? I say that looking for an affirmative, of course.

MR. FRANTZ: That's right. The golf course zoning district has a maximum height limitation.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I think it's 35 feet from what I can tell.

MR. FRANTZ: That's right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Joe, was it -- I've never -- I'm not familiar with Topgolf or any -- in fact, I don't golf. But someone said they stack them?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Typically, they're built two or three levels.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So they could do -- yeah, 35 feet, they could do --

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: And they have an entertainment booth. They have some areas for two golfers who wanted to film themselves swinging, whatever, but you're hitting out into a driving range, but it's more of an entertainment center. But -- and the nets are held by almost 60-foot towers.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Because it's -- you're -- it's not for driving a 200-yard drive. You'll hit out into the nets, you know, probably 150 yards out maybe.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Wow.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: But it is a -- the balls have chips in them and you can -- you know where the ball lands, and you can score, and there's other ways you can -- it's sort of an -- it's an entertainment. It's like a glorified bowling alley, I guess.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah. I just -- I didn't realize they were stacked. That just accommodates probably more ability for sound and light.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Oh, absolutely. I mean, this -- that would be a very intrusive use if they were to use it there. You really have to find a place in the county that -- the sports park or something like that, or that venue. They're going to be building one up in Fort Myers, I understand.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else on the panel have any questions? Ned.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: A comment, I guess, Chairman.

It seems to me that the direction that this should be taken as a result, primarily, of the public input/feedback that was received at the neighborhood information meeting where 57-5 were not -- did not find the current proposal appealing, that what should happen, I think -- unless there is a reason to proceed with greater speed -- I would respectfully urge the Board of County Commissioners to consider not moving quite as fast with this as it has apparently been docketed, but rather that the Board of County Commissioners appoint this seven-member Golden Gate City zoning advisory board to find out what it is really the people really want and ask them to confront the underlying issues, because there are some underlying difficult issues such as whether this should be better put forth as a PUD, how it would be financed, what the demographics would local government like to -- you know, how broad a segment of Collier County would be interested in this kind of a proposal.

It seems to me that the Board of County Commissioners would want that information before they took definitive action, and so I guess I'm leaning toward possibly making a motion to that effect, but I want to hear

what others say first.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else have any discussion? Go ahead, Joe.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Just one comment on the golf course. And I know the public really wants the golf course. I leave that up to the county commissioners to make that decision.

It's sort of unfair to compare the golf course up in Illinois, because a lot of the property in Illinois was actually purchased probably during the '20s and '30s, during the Depression or that era, and long paid for.

Of course, this -- the Board would have to determine whether it was going to be self-sustaining or not. But, on average, it costs, on the cheap, about 1.5 to \$1.8 million a year to maintain a golf course. So -- I know it has nothing to do with this. But the other piece of this was the -- I would say the clubhouse activity.

And I would agree that I would think this is best to turn it back over to the citizen committee. Let the citizen committee come up with a proposal, analyze whether it's cost effective to keep it as a golf course, and to make that recommendation to the Board, along with the use and any of the other intent that is being considered in regards to this PUD amendment but -- or, correction, this LDC amendment. But right now I cannot support it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Karl.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Just reading between the lines, my suspicion is that the county commissioners that generated this request are seeing the potential of having to never open the golf course again because of the financial burden of running a golf course.

Having said that, while I understand maybe why it's come to us, it just seems to me we've got a lot of people in the audience -- I put myself in their place as well. It makes sense to take a holistic view of this golf course and create a holistic plan for it and, as Mark said, if a PUD is the right way to do it, but something where it can be presented to go through the normal process whereby the residents that live near it -- within it, in the case of The Pars, really understand what they're getting rather than this very nebulous, open-ended seems to be just a gesture to try to bring in people to create an entertainment experience in the golf course. So I'd really like to see a holistic plan go through the normal process.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: My only comment is that I'm just going to reiterate, I'm not necessarily against this use. I'm against the process by which this use is being processed through our system. It isn't the right process for this community. It's not the right process for a piece of property of this size.

And as I've just heard Karl say as well is it needs to be done as a master plan effort showing all the intended uses that the county wants to have on that property so that the public can weigh in on it and have their say.

So that's the -- and as far as a motion to the Board, after Joe gets done speaking, we can entertain a motion to -- I think it's going to be recommendation not to proceed with this LDCA amendment and to consider a rezoning process to get the more holistic approach to the whole golf course package.

But go ahead, Joe.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Mark, just to -- so the public is aware, as you all know on this panel, we, over a year ago, amended the LDC to protect the community if there was going to be any conversion of a golf course to homes, and that has all been approved. It went to the Board. So there are significant protections in regards to any type of development taking place on an existing golf course, and that's already been approved and that exists. So any future plan would have to meet the requirements that currently exist right now for the conversion of a golf course to a residential community.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Unless --

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Do you want to follow up --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Unless it goes through an LDC amendment, which is probably why this process may have been chosen is to expedite it all. And, honestly, I just don't think that's the right way to go myself.

With that, anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If not, is there a motion? Ned.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I'll make a motion to slow this process down in order to have a seven-member Golden Gate City zoning advisory board appointed by the Board of County Commissioners so that the residents themselves, of this area, can have meaningful input at the very beginning to identify what it is that the folks in that part of the county would like to see and that they address the difficult questions that would be -- would have to be addressed such as process of whether it would become a PUD kind of a process or something else. Also proposed financing and the demographics. And then whatever process is identified, if any, by the local community and the residents would be a beginning point to bring it back through one of the ordinary channels that we follow.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does everybody understand that motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Motion's been made and seconded. Any further discussion? And the motion -- let me make a clarification. The motion would recommend not going forward with this LDCA amendment as proposed tonight, to go back through a more comprehensive process, including the seven-member advisory board that was supposed to have been formed. And then after that, with its finding, move into another -- a process that we would normally go through like a CU or a PUD; is that --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: That is.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So with that in mind, no other comments. All those in favor of the motion?

COMMISSIONER FRY: Discussion.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FRY: I'm just not sure -- what if a fantastic idea came tomorrow without that seven-member board being made? I'm in favor of the board, but is that necessary to -- if it went through a PUD process or it went through a normal process, is that seven-member board absolutely necessary to ensure a positive outcome, a positive plan for the residents?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm just reading the resolution that the Board signed.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: The resolution.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: They signed a resolution saying they're going to do a seven-member board to handle exactly what we're discussing tonight.

COMMISSIONER FRY: So we're really just saying execute --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Do what your resolution says.

COMMISSIONER FRY: What you resolved to do?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Or rescind the resolution.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Makes sense. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: The thing that brought me to the point of making this resolution, in addition to the fact that the Board itself created this seven-member group, is that you've got 57-5, which shows a strong community interest that should be followed up on, and more should be learned about what the local residents want, what their concerns are, and I would add to that buffering noise and the potential nuisance effects that might come along with, call it overcommercialization, but something more than just a straightforward golf course.

And, you know, have this seven-member group take a look at this and make recommendations because that's really where the grassroots is, I think.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 6-0.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a request out there to form this seven-member group. It's being advertised in one of those parts of the paper nobody ever reads, if you even get a paper anymore, and it's -- to file for it, you've got to go online which is really a nightmare, but that's the way it's done.

So you may want to take a look and figure out how to circumvent -- go through all that process, sign up for that committee. It needs seven members. I understand they don't even have seven applied yet, mostly because it's taken so long. It started in November or December of last year, and it still hasn't been decided on. But I think if you get your name in, that will help everybody move forward to pick seven people and get this thing started, and then it will go in a way that hopefully the community can be more involved.

So it's important to find that ad, find that article in the paper, and go to the Internet, to the county's volunteer boards and see if it's there to sign up for. But try to do that. That would help.

So with that, Jeremy, is that the last thing we have tonight?

MR. FRANTZ: That is.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: From you, okay. And then --

COMMISSIONER FRY: Mark, may I just ask a question as what happens now just for the benefit of the folks of the audience for the particular resolution?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It goes to -- our recommendation to not proceed with this LDC amendment with the comments that we made will go to the Board of County Commissioners next Tuesday.

MR. FRANTZ: Correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Next Tuesday, and then they'll decide what to do at that point. They are the decision makers. We recommend. So -- okay.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, is there any other public comments tonight?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Hearing none, is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion made and seconded. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We're out of here.

December 3, 2019/Special LDC meeting

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 6:28 p.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION



MARK STRAIN, CHAIRMAN

These minutes approved by the Board on 1-16-20, as presented or as corrected _____.

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED ON BEHALF OF U.S. LEGAL SUPPORT, INC., BY
TERRI LEWIS, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC.