

MINUTES
SOUTH GULF COVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SGCAC)
Wednesday, June 25, 2008
Growth Management Conference Rm. B-207 – 9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sandy Slater, *Chairperson*
Kendall Leach
April Chattinger
Yvonne Erimirio
Jim Benson

STAFF

Jie Shao, *Staff Liaison*
Gayle Moore, Recorder

MEMBERS EXCUSED

GUESTS

Karen Ireland
Fran Colosimo
Matt Trepal

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Slater called the June 25, 2008 meeting of the SGCAC to order at 9:06 a.m. as in the Growth Management Conference Room B-207 and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. Presentation by Fran Colosimo on the subject of the West County Town Center

At the request of member ***Jim Benson***, ***Mr. Fran Colosimo*** presented information on the proposed project with reference to a hand-out brochure showing possibilities for the future development of the West County Town Center site. Mr. Colosimo spoke as a representative of project applicant Dennis Fullenkamp. He reminded the group that the project would need approval of a Comprehensive Plan amendment in order to go forward as contemplated.

Staff member ***Matt Trepal, Planner III***, also spoke with regard to the possible development of the site under the Compact Mixed Use land use offered for such proposals, describing the options available for the project under the Type I level of Compact Mixed Use. The issue of density was discussed with the proviso that the plan is still being conceptualized; it was noted that the brochure mentions 2,900 residential units but the current concept is closer to 4,000 residential units. The commercial uses are contemplated to be about 1.5 million square feet, substantially less than the current entitlement of 3.4 million sq. ft.

Mr. Trepal answered various questions from the Committee members, with Mr. Colosimo and staff member Jie Shao contributing additional details. Mr. Trepal noted that after the plan amendment stage, the project would have to seek a rezoning to Planned Development; the possibility that the development would qualify as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) was also discussed. ***Mr. Colosimo*** spoke regarding the probable development schedule, and also with reference to traffic impacts over the life of the project and the desirability of a “walkable” community to capture trips within the project; ***Mr. Trepal*** also spoke on this topic.

Mr. Leach asked about the significance of the Type I, II and III designations of the Compact Mixed Use planning concepts and ***Mr. Trepal*** gave definitions of these types, which are based on density levels. There was also a brief discussion on the probable impact of the water treatment plant which is within the project boundaries; Mr. Colosimo noted that the actual site plan will likely be different from what the brochure illustrations indicate.

Mr. Leach asked about the possibility of docks on the property; **Mr. Trepal** said that issue was still undetermined, noting that a boat ramp was part of the project plan. The importance of this decision to the residents of SGC was emphasized by the Committee members, as docks would lead to a no-wake zone and reduction in speeds on the canal, which SGC residents would oppose. **Mr. Colosimo** pointed out that such a decision would be many years in the future, after the residential building had been begun.

Mr. Colosimo stated that regardless of the depiction of the project in the brochure, it was not likely to be built out as illustrated. **Mr. Trepal** compared the brochure illustrations to the conceptual development plan required to be part of the applicant's submittal; the development plan accompanying the plan amendment application is much more general.

Ms. Ermirio asked about the commercial area depicted at the juncture of the Interceptor; **Mr. Trepal** confirmed that, and related the various commercial offerings internal to the project to the goal of walkability. Further discussion ensued on this feature of the proposal.

It was noted that there is already a boat ramp planned for the area to the northeast of the project site, accessible from Cattle Dock Rd. which comes off SR 776.

Mr. Colosimo referred to Mr. Dan DeLisi, the project manager, as being available to come to a future meeting to further explain the project possibilities. He also noted that everyone was waiting for the FDOT study results, to assist with the planning process.

Chair Slater referred to the brochure's reference to potential river access via the boat ramp, asking if that passage was referring to the County boat ramp; **Mr. Trepal** said it would be outside the locks.

There being no further questions, it was noted that additional copies of the brochure would be welcome for members of the community to refer to.

Mr. Leach discussed the road improvement needed at the corner of 771 and 776 and how the intersection is being damaged by trucks turning right onto 771; he noted that the start time for the project has come and gone without any work starting and described a conversation he had with FDOT which indicated the project would start during the second week in July. Further discussion ensued on this subject and the proposed improvements timeline of 30-45 days.

Mr. Leach then asked a question of Mr. Trepal about clearing activities at the corner of 776 and Biscayne, seeking information on the project; **Mr. Colosimo** offered that he thought it was going to be an office park, according to some public information he was familiar with. *Tippecanoe Business Park* was offered as a possible name of the project. **Chair Slater** offered her opinion that the county needed to have more developments, based on her recent visits to Lee County.

Mr. Trepal and Mr. Colosimo left the meeting at 9:38 a.m.; **Jie Shao** announced that Ms. Jefferies would be addressing the meeting later today on the subject of the Quality Mining project.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

After review of the draft minutes, **Ms. Chattinger** moved that the minutes of the May 28, 2008 meeting be approved as amended, and **Mr. Leach** seconded the motion.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Parks, Park Master Plan, Entranceways, Land Acquisition, Funding Resources

Chair Slater reported on the design of entranceways with reference to drawings she brought to the meeting which she had received from Jack Paine. She stated she had a bid from the County of \$30,000 for new engineering drawings, so the ones they already have would save that much money if they could be utilized. She also had a survey which had been done by the County.

Chair Slater reported that at the MSBU meeting in April, there was agreement that there was \$257,000 total for the entrance signs, and there was discussion of available funds from MSBU funds, native tree funds and other sources to accumulate this total. Other specifications (electric; irrigation; lettering; tile) are being prepared by other committee and sub-committee members. **Mr. Benson** asked who would be maintaining the entranceways once they are in; **Chair Slater** said they would be maintained just like the parks. The target time for having the entranceways project ready to go is October 1st.

Chair Slater next advised the Committee that Jack Paine had resigned on June 19th, due to a potential conflict of interest because of his membership on the Streets and Drainage MSBU. He elected to stay on the MSBU instead of continuing as Project Manager for the entranceways. **Chair Slater** indicated she may have a candidate to step into the Project Manager position.

Further discussion ensued with reference to the engineering drawings, about the phased construction possibilities for the signs, which would leave some of the structure to be added at a later date. There was a lengthy discussion with reference to the survey drawings, about the location of the signs on the various corners including reference to County Code requirements regarding line-of-sight, etc. There would also be a requirement for fill to elevate the signs to the road level; **Ms. Ermirio** voiced a concern as to what that fill material will be.

Mr. Leach emphasized there was no discussion of changing the sign design; he reminded the group that the sandwich board signs which had been used by many of the community organizations had been discovered to be illegal. He described a suggestion by Mr. Benson at the previous month's SGCAC meeting for a Community Events sign that would be positioned "in back" of the formal entranceway sign (e.g., visible to residents as they leave the community.) **Mr. Leach** displayed a small sketch of the proposed layout / location of the signs relative to each other and he discussed the various sign/lettering possibilities for such "bulletin board" signs.

Chair Slater responded with the comments of Jack Paine who had a negative reaction to having other people come up with ideas for these signs since we were past the design stage. She also asked the members to consider whether the goal was to have South Gulf Cove blend in with other communities in the area or position itself as a "premier" waterfront community, the implication being that bulletin board signs would be "downscale". **Ms. Ermirio** spoke about her own reaction to the different kinds of signs; she doesn't want sandwich boards and is happy to find they are not permitted. She is against the bulletin board signs in back because it would interfere with the landscaping. She felt the bulletin board signs should be located elsewhere, a block away; **Mr. Leach** pointed out that these signs are not permitted in the county right-of-way ("ROW"). **Chair Slater** talked about

getting a permit to install such a sign; **Ms. Ermirio** said these entranceway signs needed a permit, so a permit should be available for other signs also. **Chair Slater** discussed this option further, noting the support for such beautification along the roadway, where it is parkland rather than ROW. Further discussion ensued on the various options and preferences.

Mr. Benson asked how important the bulletin board signs were, given the prevalence of this information available online, on the various community websites or via "email blast". He noted that there was already a sign at the Pavilion / Community Center. **Chair Slater** expressed agreement for not having the bulletin board signs. **Ms. Chattinger** expressed the point of view that there were many residents in the community that would depend on non-online sources of information. The idea of attaching items to existing county signs in the area was also raised but there was some concern that it would require County staff to post and remove such signs.

Chair Slater proposed creating a committee position to evaluate this topic, assign someone to evaluate the various concepts; she proposed taking a vote on creating this position. **Mr. Leach** asked what the other options were; the response was that this is what the committee member would discover. **Chair Slater** also said that online contact would be adequate; **Ms. Chattinger** stated that many residents are not members of any community organizations while **Ms. Ermirio** pointed out that all people do not in fact use online information sources on a daily basis. Lengthy discussion ensued.

Chair Slater proposed a motion: that this committee find a sponsor and assign a project manager who will go out and look at the requirements and investigate the alternatives, bring it back to the committee with the projected costs for approval and then if approved by this committee, so we can take it to the MSBU committee for possible inclusion in this year's budget, and if endorsed by the MSBU committee the project can go forward in this fiscal year. **Ms. Ermirio** offered a second. **Mr. Leach** asked for the motion to be restated. **Chair Slater** restated the motion: That we set up a committee to go out and investigate the new requirement for community event signs; that we assign a sponsor to investigate the feasibility of this new requirement and that it be brought back to this committee. The restated motion was seconded by **Ms. Ermirio** and discussion was opened. **Mr. Benson** asked for a time frame for the results to be available; noting that there would be no meeting in July, the members suggested August was offered as the deadline, but **Mr. Benson** asked if that would be soon enough to amend any surveys or proposals that would need to be amended. He suggested it should be a separate project, not tied to the entranceway signs. Further discussion ensued on the matter of timing. The vote to assign a sponsor to investigate the new requirement of the community event signs (Jim Benson to be the sponsor) was unanimously passed.

Mr. Leach spoke about the bid process as run by Charlotte County, with emphasis on how long the process might be expected to take, noting that there would likely be plenty of time for Mr. Benson to generate the results the committee was seeking.

Barbara Jefferies, Land Development Supervisor, joined the group shortly after 10:30 a.m. to discuss the Quality Mine/Robbins Rd. issue. She was introduced to the committee members and guests; she briefly discussed the current status of the project and then took questions from the group. **Ms. Jefferies** also discussed the mining permit application details as well as general rules for issuing mining permits, noting that County staff recommended denial of the mining permit. **Mr. Leach** asked if the decision of the Hearing

Officer could be appealed; **Ms. Jefferies** explained the applicant's alternatives (FLEUDRA) and the role of the Commissioners in the final determination.

Mr. Leach, in discussing the location of the pit, noted that when the trucks leaving the Quality Mine project via Robbin Road come to SR 771 they cross into Rotonda Sands and use the local roads there as a cut-through to Boundary and Blvd. East, on their way to the western exit of the Rotonda development; the maintenance of these local roads is paid for through an MSBU, so the community has asked the County to erect "No Through Trucks" signs in order to protect against the cost of road maintenance that the truck traffic would require. The trade-off will be more traffic on SR 771 between Robbin Rd. and Boulevard East.

Ms. Jefferies left the meeting at 10:58 a.m.

The members returned to the issue of the entranceways and **Mr. Leach** asked what is in the back of the entranceway signs and what are the entranceway signs composed of; some discussion ensued on this topic.

Mr. Leach discussed the expense aspects of the landscaping choices and what some of the available alternatives are; **Chair Slater** raised the point of how the community wants to present itself and stated that she felt the proposed landscaping added substantially to the impression the entranceway signs would make.

Zoning and FLUM; Stormwater Report

Mr. Leach revisited his information about the 776/771 turning lane; he also pointed out that the Zoning/FLUM and Deed Restrictions issue is still just moving along slowly, waiting to hear from the attorney regarding the format of the new deed restrictions.

Public Safety/Health, Pedestrian/Bikeways, FireWise Community, Cove Connection

Ms. Chattinger began with the subject of public health and safety, where there is nothing new to report, though she noted there had recently been a death in the community from someone who dove into a canal and apparently hit submerged material. Cove Connector is on a respite until September, when the next brunch is scheduled. New ideas from the brainstorming sessions include selling segments of sidewalk for naming in the future.

FireWise Communities project continues to work on the grant application. **Mr. Benson** mentioned the calculated cost for a sidewalk in front of a house; this would be about \$1,600 for about 80 feet of concrete including all permitting costs, etc., or double that for a corner lot. The point had been made that this was easier in a master-planned community where the work is done from scratch; other issues increase the costs when retrofitting a community.

Scenic Highway

Mr. Benson reported that sign placement along SR 776 was discussed at the most recent meeting; the project will go to the state for the actual signs to be created; additional sign locations along 775 will be forthcoming. Reducing "sign pollution" was also discussed as part of that effort. **Mr. Benson** stated that he was impressed with the variety of participants at the meeting. He felt the trash pick-up that is being coordinated could

probably attract some participation from this group. He stated that he will apply to be a member of the group as soon as their official application forms are available.

Mr. Benson spoke next about the clean-up effort for SR 771, which is still in the planning stages.

Ms. Ermirio made no presentation, stating that she was not "officially here" having just gotten back into town and not being prepared to speak to the group.

Regarding the monthly memos from Parks and Rec which had been distributed to the members, **Ms. Ermirio** was concerned about the scheduling of a stakeholders' meeting at a time when she would be out of town. Further discussion ensued on improving the communication between the Advisory Committee and the Parks and Rec staff.

Regarding the graphic showing where mangroves can be trimmed, **Ms. Ermirio** stated she could not be sure from the picture that the trimming is located in front of the benches, as requested.

Chair Slater commented on the Boat Ramp Park, based on the memo from Parks and Rec. On the subject of land acquisition, she noted there had been approval by the Board of County Commissioners for a land swap with Mr. Morales; acquisition activities regarding the lots at Fruitport and the Learning Garden are still in process.

There was nothing further to report on Community Plan budget matters; there is currently over \$500,000 available for community projects. **Chair Slater** reminded members that money budgeted needed to be spent or lost; she wanted to push on the projects that need the funding, keeping in mind that recent reductions in County staff have meant changes in priorities as work is scheduled, particularly with the Parks and Rec Department.

V. **NEW BUSINESS**

None.

VI. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

VII. **STAFF COMMENTS**

None.

VIII. **MEMBER COMMENTS**

Chair Slater raised the issue of choosing the officers for the committee, which is generally done during one of these summer meetings. **Mr. Leach** made a motion to have the same slate of officers for the coming year, second by **April Chattinger** and passed with a unanimous vote.

IX. **NEXT MEETING**

The next regular meeting of the **South Gulf Cove Advisory Committee** is **Wednesday, August 27, 2008** from 9:00 a.m. until 12 noon in the **Growth Management Conference Room (B-207)**.

At 11:25 a.m. **Chair Slater** stated: There being no further business to come before this committee, I declare the meeting adjourned.