

**ESTERO COMMUNITY PLANNING PANEL**  
**Minutes of Public Meeting #170 – February 16, 2015**  
**Estero Community Park, Estero, Florida**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The Meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. by ECPP Chairman Lienesch.

Panel Members present: Jack Lienesch, Chairman; Estero Community Association, Roger Strelow, ECCL; John Goodrich, ECCL; Ned Dewhirst, Estero Development Community; Paul Roberts, Estero Development Community, Neal Noethlich, Emeritus Chairman, Jeff Maas, Estero Chamber of Commerce, Greg Toth, Founding member; Bev MacNellis, Treasurer (arrived late) and Howard Levitan, Secretary. No member was absent for tonight's meeting.

Also present were Nick Batos, Chairman of the ECCL, various representatives of Stock Development and their agents, and many members of the public mostly from the Wildcat Run Community and the other Eastern Corkscrew Communities. Finally, Sharon Jenkins-Owen from the Lee County DCD Planning Staff was also present at this meeting.

Public Notice: Secretary Levitan reported that the meeting notice was posted on the ECPP website. The Agenda has been posted for over a week on the website. He noted that a quorum of the ECPP was present for this meeting.

Minutes of the Prior Meetings. Chairman Lienesch reported that the minutes of the January 26, 2015 Meeting of the Panel were prepared by the Secretary, had been vetted by the Panel, and had been posted on our ECPP website. Subsequent to posting there were two minor corrections by Neal Noethlich and Greg Toth, which have been corrected and will be reposted with the final version. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed to accept the January minutes as corrected to be replaced on the website.

Treasurer's Report: Treasurer MacNellis arrived too late to present her Treasurer's Report.

**PRESENTATIONS:**

1. Genova Development Comp Plan Amendment and Rezoning: Preliminary Presentation

Materials presented for review: Genova CP – Site Plan 3 by Wallace Homes dated 1/28/2015.

Presentation by the Developer. The presentation was made by Jim Wallace of Wallace Homes and Josh Philpott, Senior Planner from Stantec, Fort Myers. This is a preliminary presentation and does not count as a Public Information Meeting for purposes of the requirements of the Land Development Code.

The concept presented by Jim Wallace is for U shaped buildings with six buildings overall in the development. There would be a clubhouse with fitness center and a covered 25 meter swimming pool. Wallace showed the architectural plans for the buildings, which would include three

stories of residential units over the garage space. The garage level has a unique internal courtyard, which will extend up through the plaza level, which is the first residential floor. There would be two car garages for each unit, which include garage doors. Wallace stated that this design format would reduce the number of parking spaces on the outside of the buildings, and place approximately 21 spaces for guest parking inside each garage scattered around. The atrium or courtyard feature would be unique, and would also serve the purpose of ventilation for the garage.

Typical buildings are U-shaped and all of the living spaces, master bedrooms, lanais and terrace areas are facing the courtyard overlooking the atrium. This is designed in Mediterranean style, but was referenced by Wallace as having a Genoa, Italy style of design with a more urban Italianate theme. Some of the buildings are both three and four stories over parking that step up so that the roofline is varied. The buildings are designed to be as attractive on the outside as the inside. The exterior façade abuts not residences or unit windows, but rather the inside corridor for access to the units. Color schemes will be somewhat consistent throughout the development, and will be harmonious with 9 colors in the palette.

The proposed site plan was then discussed. The Corkscrew and Sandy Lane Overlay Districts require the buildings to be right next to the roads (Corkscrew and Via Coconut). They have moved the buildings back from the road and created a linear park on both sides of the building. There is also a connection on the south as near to the proposed Western exit to the Community Park. This will be a gated community, but without as many walls, as the buildings themselves act as the walls with security fencing in between. The openings in the garages at ground level will have wrought iron security fencing and this feature will also be used between the buildings. The lakes shown on the Site Plan are also security features for this community. There will be a gatehouse on the exit, but carefully designed with the actual security component interior to the architectural features nearest the road. They are considering adding landscaping to the median on Via Coconut adjacent to this development. They also may want to add canopy trees along the road and move the sidewalks back so that the road would be quieted or calmed.

Wallace stated that he had had some discussions with Seth Harry (Estero Consultant for the Village Center Project) to develop the idea to move the sidewalks with the canopy trees and put a wall 5 feet from the property line. This could also be proposed as three feet of buffering with a two foot security wall. Harry is also talking about having some form of smaller, studio or one-bedroom apartment added to the exterior of the garage level looking out to the landscaping to have a softer view upwards. They still are in flux on all of these additional exterior Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) concepts. No consensus was achieved between Seth Harry and Jim Wallace, who stated that ultimately Estero has to decide what it wants, e.g. would it be better to have a linear park or these ADU residences along the roadways? There would be more density required to do the exterior units at ground level. He went on to state that he believes that most people feel that Via Coconut will change over time, but this would be Estero's decision.

Josh Philpott, from Stantec, then spoke to some of the land use decisions that they will be looking for. Currently 17 acres of the site is in the Suburban Land Use Category allowing 6 units/acre. The current plan is for 195 units, which would be about 11 units/acre and if they do the exterior ADU units it would be about 12 units/acre. They are proposing to present a

Comprehensive Plan Amendment seeking to change all of the property to the Intensive Development Category. They also will do a concurrent rezoning to Residential Planned Development (RPD). There currently is 4 acres zoned Commercial Planned Development (CPD) in the northeast corner which allows about 50,000 s.f. of commercial uses, therefore they believe that switching to RPD for the whole will reduce the overall traffic impacts.

Comments from the Panel:

Jeff Maas. Asked whether there is a fence or wall around the property? They do not plan to have a perimeter wall, but the buildings act as their own security fence with railings/fences between them which likely will not be seen. Maas then asked what the interplay is with the Community Park? They responded that there is a pedestrian gate at the South and perhaps one on the east side of the property into the Park. The County may want the interconnect to be through the main gate of the park rather than the planned interconnects, because the park is locked at night. Maas also asked what the overall height would be, and the answer given was 45 feet to the eaves.

Paul Roberts. Wanted to clarify that the exterior corridor around each floor would be air conditioned. The answer was yes, and the windows on the corridor would be hurricane glass with the other side of the exterior corridor made from cinder blocks for reduction of noise transmission. Roberts stated that he has no issue with the density, and likes the Seth Harry suggestions.

John Goodrich. Asked about the linear park along Corkscrew and whether it will run down Via Coconut as well. The issue for the developer is satisfying SFWMD with respect to sufficient water management resources. One of the discussions at the EDRC on this project was a bus stop in front of the Via Coconut side or at least a pull off. Wallace stated that this would require County permission. To clarify the height limits, Wallace reiterated that the buildings will be no higher than 3 stories over parking and 45 feet to the eaves.

Greg Toth. He disclosed his conflict of interest in this project. He does not like Seth Harry's suggestions.

Roger Strelow. He thinks this is a very innovative plan. He suggests that they use this development and community as a model for bicycle improvements instead of three-foot wall along the roadside. He wants to use a bike path/sidewalk rather than the roadway. Wallace does not want to lose the linear park along the roadways, but also stated that he likes the added density of the ADUs. Wallace and his team are still in the process of thinking about these concepts in the hopes that somehow they can do both. They do not necessarily like the wall that Seth Harry has suggested.

Ned Dewhirst. Dewhirst stated that he thought the project was well done and well thought out. He advises that when going through the comp. plan amendment and zoning to get the additional density, they include all of these drawings as exhibits of what they are proposing to ensure that the final development order is consistent with the high quality plans they are showing tonight. He favors the linear park at least on Via Coconut, but not necessarily on Corkscrew, since the

sidewalk is close to the road anyway. Also wants to see interconnection with the park, and believes that they will need a deviation for the lack of a second egress. In discussion about building the swimming pool as part of the community park, Wallace also clearly stated that they could not allow the swimming pool to be a public facility. Wallace also disclosed that they are currently seeking an administrative amendment with respect to the CPD area to allow a temporary real estate sales facility near to the adjacent existing cell phone tower.

Chairman Lienesch read the comments from Don Eslick with respect to the Seth Harry/Spikowski Final Report on the Town Center Project (included as a separate attachment). Eslick is opposed to this project and asked that these comments will be a part of and attached to the minutes, which will be done as per Chairman Lienesch. With respect to the pool issue mentioned in the letter, Jim Wallace specifically restated that it would not work, and could not be done.

Neal Noethlich. He is concerned more about process than the architecture. They will have to deal with LDOT as to the sidewalk proposals along with amendments to the Comp. Plan, Rezoning and administrative amendment/deviations. He would like to see a cooperative team going forward so that there is full agreement for the public hearing before the future PZB or Council. They stated that they know they have to coordinate with all sorts of agencies on this project, including LDOT, which has the ROW at present. Noethlich is suggesting that their be a team effort on this development.

#### Comments from the Public:

Patty Whitehead. She asked about the Spikowski discussion held at Estero Fire and Rescue, and about affordable housing needs in Estero. The developer stated that the price point here would be \$250K-450K and some of the ADU's would be \$250K-295K. The issue is whether this is affordable housing. She asked about the homeowners' fees, and the response was without tennis or golf or dining, they would be about \$500 per year.

Jim Dodge from Wildcat Run. He also suggested putting in the pool on the park property, but Jim Wallace said it would be a problem with security and exclusivity for the residents. It simply is a fact that it is not what people are looking for today from a market standpoint. Wallace believes that the buyers want to obtain a variety of amenities, but at a reasonable cost.

Chairman Lienesch summarized that overall the ECPP supports this project based on these preliminary drawings. There is an issue with the interrelationship of the project with the overall Seth Harry/Spikowski report. Wallace said that he and Harry are in harmony, and that it is now a question of whether Estero is in agreement. There are opinions on both sides of whether to do the linear park or the additional ADUs.

#### 2. Via Coconut Point Urban Place/MPD:

Materials presented for review: Application for Planned Development Public Hearing filed January 20, 2015 with the Lee County DCD; Context Map of Area Dated 1-08-2015; Proposed

Site Plans from Fugleberg-Koch PLLC; Character Images dated 2/16/2015, and Estero Master Plan Side by Side also dated 2/16/2015.

Presentation by the Developer: Steve Hartsell, Esq. of the Pavese Law Firm and Laura DeJohn from Johnson Engineering represented the developer, Focus Development Group, LLC. Jeff Graef of Focus Development was also present along with Bob Koch, Architect. This is the second presentation before the Panel, since the preliminary discussion in July, 2014. The proposal relates to an 18-acre parcel along Via Coconut on the west side. It is zoned AG-2 and is designated as Suburban with 6 units/acre and is in the Mixed Use Overlay. The property is located east of Happy Hollow Lane as it goes up to Corkscrew Road. The 2035 EAR Plan for the County called for this area to become Urban Place with higher density, however the County has not moved forward in enacting these recommendations. They are seeking a land use Comp. Plan Amendment to a new land use category consistent with the Urban Place concept. This would allow 18 units/acre density based on the bonus density by virtue of the mixed-use overlay. There would be a maximum of 335 units on the site plus 30,000 s.f. of commercial space in the narrow part of the land on the north side going up to Corkscrew Road. They say that they have coordinated with the Seth Harry/Bill Spikowski Plan Report, and have changed their designs to comply with the concepts envisioned by this study.

The Comp. Plan Amendment application has been found to be sufficient by Lee County Staff, and they say that the Zoning Application will be deemed sufficient when they have these minutes completed. They are moving forward in the review process with County Staff on the theory that is likely that the Village of Estero will also be contracting for review with the Lee County DCD Staff, but the ultimate decision on the applications will be up to the Village Council both as to process and the final approval. This current discussion will act as the public informational meeting required by the current Land Development Code which will become Estero's transitional Land Development Code.

Laura DeJohn, from Johnson Engineering, gave the background of how the plan has evolved since the July, 2014 presentation. They will be seeking the Mixed Use Plan Development (MPD) designation, however the residential density will be located on the bottom parcel with 30,000 s.f. of commercial space on the northern side running up to Corkscrew Road. Working with Spikowski and Seth Harry, they looked at the bigger picture of the Village Center across the railroad Right of Way (ROW). The emphasis of the Harry/Spikowski Report is on how to connect the development(s) on the North Point land to the west of the railroad ROW with the Community Park, which would be a significant part of the planning for the overall Village Center project.

She also discussed the issues of the Sandy Lane and Corkscrew Overlays, both of which seek to push the buildings up to the street line. Seth Harry thinks we should turn Via Coconut into a two-lane roadway with on-street parking rather than a four-lane 45 mile/hour roadway. They want to design to this concept even though it may be difficult for Estero to achieve this plan. She then stated that their plan is consistent with a zero to 25-foot setback along Corkscrew and Via Coconut Roads. In other words, they would meet current Code, but plan for the future if Estero can make their plans for Via Coconut Road come to fruition. They also have been working with Seth Harry and Spikowski in the central area of their development plan with a roundabout which would be an activity mode to allow for public interconnectivity if there

ultimately is an east-west connection in this area from the North Point property across the ROW to the Community Park.

As stated previously, they are seeking a new land use designation, which they call the Via Coconut Place Urban Category. They are also seeking several deviations for the number of parking spaces in the residential portion, and they seek to not require the internal roads to meet normal street row standards. They also are asking for a deviation for buffering requirements near residential areas in the north part near Happy Hollow lane.

Bob Koch, architect, then presented the architectural features of the site plan. The site along Via Coconut was predetermined for turns in and out due to the median cuts that presently exist. The one in the center of the project would be the primary connective corridor. They understand that the railroad ROW is a real barrier and the interconnection may never occur. The evolution of the centerpiece therefore became an important aspect of the planning for this development, especially to make it attractive and usable even if the interconnect never gets built. They felt that this internal road has to deaden traffic, and thus they decided to utilize a roundabout. This also gives better pedestrian connectivity going north and south. On this connectivity corridor they are also putting mixed-use liner buildings for retail. In other words, the crescent curved buildings along the central right of way would be designed as commercial below with residential units above. Koch feels that putting residences right to the street along Via Coconut for new urban purposes may not be feasible without some buffer zone along the street. These are three-story buildings some of which are facing the building and others are on the other side near the parking. There are two possible east-west crossings based on the current median cuts. The north portion is commercial and they have allocated some connectivity in the planning to interconnect at this point as well (although it not really likely that Estero will be able to obtain two RR crossings). Looking at the plans in the Seth Harry Report, he stated that the interconnections on his plans are the same two connections on an east-west basis.

Koch continued with a discussion of design features in garden districts of various urban areas, including having a stoop or front porch above ground level. They also had a third entrance on the site at the south side for emergency basis, however there is no median cut there and the County was not favorable to this. One problem that Koch has with the Town Center Plan is that the Seth Harry/Spikowski Report did not discuss a unified plan for storm water retention thereby leaving it up to each individual parcel. In this case, the only lake big enough for water retention on their parcel is on the widest part of the parcel at the Southern end. They say that comparing their plan to the Seth Harry plans, it matches up completely. They also say it would be designed for workforce housing.

#### Comments from the Panel.

Secretary Levitan asked a procedural question as to the requests before the County for right of way vacations. They say that there is a drainage easement running east-west on the property, but not a public ROW. Greg Toth explained that the owners/sellers of the property have a proposed ROW vacation pending for the north/south segment of former Sandy lane that is no longer needed due to construction of Via Coconut Point.

Roger Strelow. This is a property at the east end of a larger piece of property, and he appreciates the careful, creative thinking about how to interconnect to the other lands in the planning process. He thinks we in Estero should therefore be as helpful as possible to the developer and continue to work with them.

Ned Dewhirst. In general it looks like a great project, and he has no problem with the additional density, although for him it is hard to tell what the density is contemplated to be. The proposed CPA is requesting a standard density of 18 units per ac resulting in 333 MF units. The MPD is proposing 297 units on the 16-acre residential parcel at a density of 18 units/acre. Therefore, they are not doing a so-called super mixed-use project with double counting of the commercial acreage. How do we make sure that we get what is described on the Site Plan and photos into the comp. plan amendments and zoning approvals? How do we get the quality of the residential structures as shown on their comparative buildings from other projects? They have not done any detailed building designs yet. Dewhirst says that there needs to be some building and elevation exhibits as part of the zoning request so that we are assured of the high quality of the buildings being represented at this time in exchange for allowing the significant increase in density. Dewhirst then asked whether the main future interconnection to the west would be treated as a public road. If so, there needs to be an access easement to this interconnection or a requirement for public dedication in the zoning approval. He is also concerned from the point of view of the development community where the developers are conforming to a plan concept, like the Harry/Spikowski Report, that is not regulatory. He feels that this is sort of a de facto regulatory plan that has not been approved but we are designing projects to comply with it. Finally, Dewhirst feels that they need to do a better job of buffering along Happy Hollow Road and not deviate from the requirements of the LDC. They responded that additional buffering does not seem right to them, since this area may likely be redeveloped into a commercial area at some future point. Dewhirst responded that this deviation may be difficult to obtain, and the County may need to protect these single-family residents by buffering the commercial areas.

Neal Noethlich. With respect to Walmart, they were able to get the planning concepts regulatory in the approval process.

Greg Toth. Disclosed his conflict of interest with this project due to his interest in the parcel as an owner. He appreciates the effort to line up with the North Point planning done by Seth Harry/Spikowski. He stated that they have already bought one house at the end of Happy Hollow, and there are three more plus the greenhouse, mostly which are used for rentals.

John Goodrich. He wants more clarity as to what happens along Corkscrew Road next to the agriculture building. They show two commercial buildings. The north building is consistent with the Sandy Lane Overlay orienting the building to the corner. It will be right at the sidewalk at this point, which is zero setback (Sandy Lane Overlay is 0 to 25 feet). He does not like this even though it is in compliance with the Overlay. These commercial buildings are only pads since no tenants have been identified, and they said things may change over time. The owner is still trying to obtain some of the parcels on Happy Hollow to make the corner more attractive. John Goodrich again repeated that he does not like the corner building setback.

They stated that they have to revise the MCP for the County. Dewhirst added that he was concerned about ECPP not having the MCP, the requested deviations, or a schedule of uses along with a full application at the time of our review. Dewhirst then asked whether they are planning on coming back to the Panel when they have a full application to present to us. Hartsell responded in the negative, that this would be the only public information meeting. Hartsell did read off the schedule of uses that they propose. It does include fast food, which caused some issues with the Panel. Greg Toth asked them to tailor down the schedule of uses, but Dewhirst said that it is hard to properly respond to just an oral presentation of the uses. Hartsell stated that they understand that we have concerns about gas pumps or fast food. They will get the full application to us including the MCP, Deviations and Schedule of Uses, but do not plan on returning for an additional public information meeting.

Paul Roberts: He stated that he does not have a problem with this development.

Jeff Maas: Maas stated that he was acceptable to a fast food use for the crescent areas in the development, but not with a drive through window as a standalone on Corkscrew or down Via Coconut.

#### Comments from the Public:

Bill Prysi from the EDRC echoed some of the comments, but stated that based on the previous project which had a commitment of quality and vision, this plan has presented nothing but a site plan to look at with no features that gives us the assurance of high quality.

Chairman Lienesch summarized the feelings of the Panel that we cannot send to the County any sense of whether we are in support of this project, since we have not seen a full application. Hartsell stated that Lee County will not be giving any approvals with respect to this project. It will be decided completely by the Village, but they are continuing with the process of review with Lee County Staff. They understand that the Comp. Plan Amendment needs to get done first and then they will combine it with the zoning application to get the final approvals by the Village Council. Chairman Lienesch also stated that the Panel was not in favor of the deviation for buffering adjacent to the housing on the north side. He also reiterated that they agreed to email us the MCP, Deviations, and the schedule of uses. Dewhirst suggested the panel review these documents and send comments by email only so to alleviate another panel meeting attendance; the panel members agreed.

#### 3. Corkscrew Crossing MPD.

Materials Presented for review: PPT dated 2/16/2015; Resubmittal Documents including Aerial MP Overlay-Site by Grady Minor dated 2/5/15, AMC Master Plan (Rev. 2) – C – Plan by Grady Minor dated 2/4/15, and Traffic Impact Study by JMP Transportation Engineers, Inc. dated 1/27/2015.

Presentation by the Developer. The presentation was made by Wayne Arnold and Sharon Umphenaur from Grady Minor and Jim Banks as to the traffic impact study (TIS). They came to us in October as a preliminary informational meeting, until they got sufficiency comments from

the Staff, which they now have. The Project consists of 396 acres with access onto Corkscrew Road, and was previously zoned for 724 units, mostly multi-family units. They think that the market is now single-family so they are reducing the density to 625 units. One identifiable issue still outstanding is the wildlife corridor, which would come down from Wild Blue, and the panther crossing near the Preserve to the East.

Off-site preserve areas are on the Preserve to the east, and winding down to the South of their lot. They have a drainage feature along the east and which then discharges to the south. They are working on development standards similar to other RPDs in Estero. The Multi-family product will be on the north side of the project and will be better identified as per Staff comments to them. They are also planning for an emergency interconnect with Wildcat Run, however it is not yet known whether Wildcat Run has agreed to this as an interconnect or just an emergency exit. This is a 100% residential project therefore there should be less concern about architecture for Estero. They want comments from us at this meeting, and will then go back to Staff for a more detailed view to achieve sufficiency. They likely will have to go to the planned Estero Planning and Zoning Board, and then on to the Village Council for final hearing. They are in the ERP process with South Florida Water Management (SFWMD), and have not gone back to the Army Corps of Engineers yet with revised plans.

#### Comments from the Panel:

Ned Dewhirst. He asked about the planned interconnect with Wildcat Run at the least for emergencies, which would likely benefit both communities. Wildcat Run stated that they have several access points therefore any emergency exits to their streets would not benefit them.

Neal Noethlich also talked about the access points. He asked about the potential purchaser, which was stated to be a company named Argo Corkscrew. His issues are water sources and flow and whether they have to tie into the Wildcat Run water systems for flow ways, ditches and canals. They said they have no connections, but SFWMD may have different thoughts. Noethlich is also concerned about building heights and site lines. Wayne Arnold said the height limitation is 35 feet (two stories) for the residential and 48 feet for the multi-family, which is what was already approved in the previous zoning.

Jeff Maas asked where the amenities were, and Arnold replied on the east boundary. No commercial areas are currently planned.

Howard Levitan asked from a procedural basis as to whether the TIS include potential development from Wild Blue. They say the answer may be different at the development order stage depending on who gets their zoning application done first (i.e. Wild Blue or this project). It depends on which stage the TIS relates to determine which project has to include the traffic generated by the other planned development.

#### Comments from the Public:

Glen Lawler from Wildcat Run. He asked them to show on the site plan where the homes are proposed and what they will consist of. They say this is shown on the Master Concept Plan, but

it will be one of several varieties of single family, multi-family and villas with common wall. They have not determined how and what will actually be built or where. The people from Wildcat Run are concerned about this especially as to the setbacks and buffer zones. Arnold said that the two developments will be separated based on the roads and buffer and the so-called moat on Wildcat Run property plus the 5-foot residential buffer on the Corkscrew Crossing side. The “moat” ditch is probably 20 feet wide to the property line.

Stewart Katz from Wildcat Run. He asked what the height limitation is on the two-family homes, and the answer given was 35 feet.

Joe Turkell from Wildcat Run asked about the height limitation on multi-family, and the response was 4 stories and 48 feet as allowed by the previous zoning. He asked whether they could put the amenities package on the west side, but Arnold said that this would cause light and noise problems for the adjacent homes in Wildcat Run.

Kate Kurtz from Wildcat Run. She wanted to know about the parking, but Arnold reiterated that this has not been defined yet. She also wanted to know about security, since the moat dries up in the Winter season. They say there will be a perimeter berm but do not yet know about a fence.

Karen Katz from Wildcat Run asked whether it would be a gated community, and the answer was yes.

Jim Kurtz from Wildcat Run. He stated that the traffic is already a real problem for Corkscrew Road.

An unidentified person asked what would be the price point of the units? The answer was market rates at the time they develop.

Joe Tergiligen. In the Monte Christo Plan there was a common entrance with Wildcat Run leading to two gates. Now their entrance has been moved over to one side so no common entrance. He repeated that no emergency access is needed for Wildcat Run, so there is no benefit to them to have an emergency interconnect. Arnold stated that Staff is likely to push for the emergency connection point.

Russ Radcliffe from Wildcat Run. They think that the water flow is a key issue and they do not want to lose any water barrier. They are also concerned about Corkscrew Road getting to 4-lane status.

David Bradford from Wildcat Run. He asked about the water flow as well. Arnold stated that with respect to the water flow from their property, they need to go through an ERP (environmental resource permit) with SFWMD. They cannot impact the Wildcat Run site. He believes that they will ultimately develop 625 units with 62 multi-family units. Nothing will preclude them changing the mix but they have to stay in the areas shown on the MCP. Bradford then asked about setbacks, and Arnold answered that they would be 20’ and 25’ to water. He went on to state that they are not required to do berms or walls. They are only providing for

minimum type A residential buffers at present, but likely this will be market driven based on the level of the buildings.

Kathleen Fitzgerald (Wildcat Run HOA President) wants to see a more attractive buffer than a Type A plan. Wayne Arnold agreed to meet further with Wildcat Run as they progress with the permitting.

Fred Fitzgerald with Wildcat Run. He asked whether from a procedural point of view can a plan be relooked at later on after it has been approved? Arnold stated that they are vested with what got approved in the past, but are now asking for some changes. These revisions need to get approved by the Village Council as an amendment to the RPD. The issue may also be if Estero changes the time frame for coming back for approvals if a project is not built after a certain time period. Presently there is no end to an approved plan under Lee County Land Development Code.

Chairman Lienesch summarized the fact that this plan has been back to the ECPP many times over the years and has vested approvals. The amendments seem to have the general support of the Panel, but there is still a long way to go with respect to this project. The final approvals will be determined by the Village Council.

#### **ECPP ISSUES:**

1. ECPP Procedures Post Incorporation. The Panel will have a meeting in March, and they will continue on in the same fashion until the Village Council says otherwise. Ned Dewhirst feels that there may be a need for the facilitation of public informational meetings well before any final review / decisions by a zoning or development review board, which the ECPP could still deal with if it continued in the same fashion. The problem with this is whether we would have enough volunteers in Estero to populate the Panel along with the other advisory boards.

2. Land Development Code Revisions. Bill Prysi will finish the LDC Revisions draft and give to Roger Strelow for the Transition Book. This will not be the all-inclusive version of the drafts.

3. Member Issues: Howard Levitan has to resign as secretary on 3/3/2015 when the members-elect to the Village Council go into the Sunshine. Jack Lienesch asked for a volunteer to do this for a few months. No volunteers stepped forward at the meeting. Greg Toth will ask at the University for a volunteer. Jack Lienesch also asked whether anyone does not want to continue on to be considered for the PZB. John Goodrich and Jack Lienesch both said that they would prefer not to move to the PZB. All others stated that they would like to do this.

4. Public Comments: None

Next Meeting is March 16, 2015

Meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Howard Levitan, Secretary