TO: Collier County Rural Golden Gate Estates Restudy Advisory Committee
FROM: RVi Planning + Landscape Architecture
DATE: August 17, 2026
SUBJECT: April 22, 2026 Community Survey Memorandum
RE: Rural Golden Gate Estates Restudy - Commercial Location Survey Summary

Executive Summary

Twenty-two (22) completed commercial development preference surveys were submitted by members of the public. All submitted forms were counted as individual responses, including forms associated with the same street address. The survey results reflect a stronger overall preference against new commercial development within the Rural Golden Gate Estates than in favor of it. Of the 22 respondents who answered the question regarding commercial development within the Estates, 12 respondents (57.1%) opposed or strongly opposed new commercial development, eight respondents (38.1%) supported or strongly supported it, and one respondent (4.8%) was neutral.

Responses regarding commercial development outside the Estates were more mixed and generally more favorable. Of the 16 respondents who answered that portion of the question, seven respondents (43.8%) supported or strongly supported commercial development outside the Estates, six respondents (37.5%) opposed or strongly opposed it, and three respondents (18.8 %) were neutral. This distinction was also evident in the written comments, where several respondents who opposed commercial development within the Estates expressed support for commercial services at perimeter locations, along wider roads, or in existing and planned activity centers.

The most frequently selected corridor was Immokalee Road, and the most frequently selected intersection was Immokalee Road/Wilson Boulevard. However, a substantial minority selected options indicating that commercial development should not be allowed along major corridors or at major intersections. The most commonly supported commercial use was small neighborhood services, followed closely by agricultural-related businesses and a neighborhood commercial shopping center with a grocery anchor. The leading concerns were loss of rural character, increased traffic, environmental impacts, safety, and noise. Traffic controls and road improvements were the most frequently selected condition that could make commercial development more acceptable.

Meeting Overview

The Collier County Rural Golden Gate Estates Restudy Advisory Committee held a regular public meeting on April 22, 2026, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at Max A. Hasse Jr. Community Park. The commercial development agenda item included a presentation regarding the Collier Interactive Growth Model, commercial supply and future demand, projected population growth, infrastructure planning, and the potential role of commercial services in reducing vehicle miles traveled.

Survey forms were made available to obtain resident input concerning support for commercial development within and outside the Estates, preferred commercial locations, preferred use types, concerns, and potential development conditions. The official meeting minutes separately

document Advisory Committee discussion and unanimous motions opposing future commercial development within Rural Golden Gate Estates, recommending termination of the Randall Boulevard commercial subdistrict, and recommending deletion of the transitional conditional use. These committee actions are part of the meeting record but are distinct from the individual survey tabulation summarized in this memorandum

Survey Methodology

The consultant team manually reviewed and tabulated each submitted two-page survey form. Multiple-response questions were counted by selection, meaning that totals for those questions exceed the number of surveys. Percentages for single-response questions are calculated using the number of respondents who answered the applicable question. Percentages for multiple-response questions are calculated against all 22 surveys and should be understood as the share of surveys selecting each option.

All 22 submitted surveys were counted as individual responses. The packet includes multiple forms associated with the same address, including four forms from 2230 18th Avenue NE and two forms from 2193 Vermont Lane. These may represent separate individuals within the same household rather than duplicate submissions. Because the survey did not limit participation to one response per address, no forms were removed or consolidated. Three forms were annotated as being completed by persons who did not reside in Rural Golden Gate Estates; those forms were also retained because they were submitted as part of the meeting survey record.

Several forms contained ambiguous or internally inconsistent markings, such as selecting both a specific corridor and the option prohibiting corridor commercial development. Where a checkbox was visibly marked, it was counted. Handwritten clarifications were considered in the qualitative discussion. Results should therefore be interpreted as a summary of the submitted survey packet rather than a statistically representative community-wide poll.

Survey Results

3.1 Support or Opposition to Commercial Development

Response	Within the Estates	Outside the Estates	Observation
Strongly support	6 (28.6%)	2 (12.5%)	More support was expressed for development within the Estates by a concentrated group of respondents.
Somewhat support	2 (9.5%)	5 (31.3%)	Moderate support was more common for development outside the Estates.
Neutral	1 (4.8%)	3 (18.8%)	Neutral responses were limited.
Somewhat oppose	3 (14.3%)	3 (18.8%)	
Strongly oppose	9 (42.9%)	3 (18.8%)	Strong opposition was the single largest response category for

			development within the Estates.
No response	1	6	Outside-the-Estates responses were left blank more often.

A majority of respondents answering the question opposed new commercial development within the Estates. By contrast, responses concerning development outside the Estates were more evenly distributed, with a slight plurality supporting it. Written comments reinforce this distinction. Several respondents stated that commercial services should remain outside the interior of the Estates, be located along wider roads, or be concentrated in existing or planned centers.

3.2 Preferred Road Corridors

Corridor	Selections	Percent of Surveys
Immokalee Road	11	50.0%
Do not allow along major corridors	7	31.8%
Oil Well Road	6	27.3%
Collier Boulevard	3	13.6%
Desoto Boulevard	2	9.1%
Randall Boulevard	1	4.5%
Vanderbilt Beach Road	1	4.5%
Golden Gate Boulevard	1	4.5%
Wilson Boulevard	1	4.5%
Everglades Boulevard	1	4.5%

Immokalee Road was the clear leading corridor preference, selected on half of all surveys. Oil Well Road was the second most frequently selected named corridor. At the same time, nearly one-third of the surveys selected the option stating that commercial development should not be allowed along major corridors. The corridor results therefore do not reflect a single consensus. They instead show a prominent preference for Immokalee Road among respondents open to commercial development, alongside a substantial group opposing corridor-based commercial development altogether.

3.3 Preferred Major Intersections

Intersection	Selections	Percent of Surveys
Immokalee Road/Wilson Boulevard	13	59.1%
Oil Well Road/Everglades Boulevard	7	31.8%
Oil Well Road/Desoto Boulevard	6	27.3%
Do not allow at major intersections	6	27.3%
Wilson Boulevard/Golden Gate Boulevard expansion	5	22.7%
Immokalee Road/Everglades Boulevard expansion	4	18.2%
Vanderbilt Beach Road/Collier Boulevard	4	18.2%

Collier Boulevard/Golden Gate Boulevard	3	13.6%
Golden Gate Boulevard/Everglades Boulevard expansion	3	13.6%
Randall Boulevard/Everglades Boulevard	1	4.5%
Vanderbilt Beach Road/Wilson Boulevard	1	4.5%

Immokalee Road/Wilson Boulevard was the most frequently selected location, appearing on 13 of the 22 surveys. Oil Well Road/Everglades Boulevard and Oil Well Road/Desoto Boulevard formed a second tier of preferred locations. Six surveys opposed commercial development at major intersections altogether. Several respondents selected both named locations and a prohibitory option, accompanied by handwritten notes indicating that selected locations were intended to be outside the interior Estates or along roads perceived as capable of carrying traffic.

3.4 Supported Commercial Uses

Commercial Use	Selections	Percent of Surveys
Small neighborhood services (e.g., convenience store or cafe)	11	50.0%
Agricultural-related businesses (e.g., feed store or nursery)	9	40.9%
Neighborhood commercial shopping center with grocery anchor	9	40.9%
Offices (e.g., medical or real estate)	2	9.1%
None	2	9.1%
Community commercial shopping center with retail anchor	1	4.5%

The results indicate greater acceptance of smaller-scale or locally oriented commercial services than larger retail formats. Small neighborhood services were selected most often. Agricultural-related businesses and grocery-anchored neighborhood centers tied for the second-highest number of selections. Only one respondent selected a community commercial shopping center with a retail anchor. Written comments supporting commercial development focused primarily on daily-needs shopping, grocery access, shorter travel distances, and convenience for families and seniors.

3.5 Concerns Regarding Commercial Development

Concern	Selections	Percent of Surveys
Loss of rural character	13	59.1%
Increased traffic	11	50.0%
Environmental impacts	10	45.5%
Safety concerns	10	45.5%
Noise	10	45.5%

Property value impacts	9	40.9%
Lighting/glare	8	36.4%
No concerns	6	27.3%

Loss of rural character was the most frequently identified concern, followed by increased traffic, environmental, safety, and noise concerns were each selected on nearly half of the surveys. Six respondents selected no concerns, largely corresponding with the group strongly supporting grocery-anchored neighborhood commercial development. One survey used the handwritten response "ALL" rather than checking individual boxes; for tabulation purposes, that response was counted under each listed concern.

3.6 Conditions That Could Improve Acceptability

Condition	Selections	Percent of Surveys
Traffic controls and road improvements	16	72.7%
Strict limits on building size and height	10	45.5%
Increased buffers	8	36.4%
Noise restrictions	7	31.8%
Limits on hours of operation	6	27.3%
Lighting restrictions	6	27.3%
Architectural/rural design standards	5	22.7%
Increased setbacks	4	18.2%
No conditions would make development acceptable	3	13.6%

Traffic controls and road improvements were selected on nearly three-quarters of the surveys and were the strongest point of agreement across respondents with differing views on commercial development. Building size and height limits were the next most frequently selected measure, followed by buffers and operational restrictions. Three respondents indicated that no conditions would make commercial development acceptable. The results suggest that location alone would not resolve community concerns and that infrastructure, scale, buffering, and operations would remain central to any future policy discussion.

Key Themes

Preservation of Rural Character

The most consistent concern was that additional development could erode the low-density, rural character that distinguishes the Estates. Opposing comments referenced prior moves from more urbanized communities, resistance to density and multifamily development, and a desire to maintain large lots and undeveloped areas.

Convenient Access to Daily Needs

Supportive respondents emphasized the distance residents currently travel for groceries and basic services. Several comments stated that a neighborhood center or grocery store could reduce travel time, improve convenience for seniors and families, support local employment, and create a stronger sense of community.

Infrastructure Before or With Development

Traffic and road capacity appeared repeatedly in both supportive and opposing comments. Respondents called for road improvements, wider roads, better connections to Interstate 75, sidewalks, bicycle facilities, parks, and other infrastructure before additional commercial or residential growth.

Preference for Limited Scale and Strategic Locations

Where commercial development was supported, respondents generally favored neighborhood-scale services, agricultural-related businesses, and grocery-anchored centers rather than larger retail centers. Immokalee Road/Wilson Boulevard was the most commonly identified location, while some respondents favored perimeter or expansion intersections outside the interior Estates.

Environmental and Compatibility Protections

Environmental impacts, buffers, lighting, noise, building size, and setbacks were recurring concerns. Comments and selections reflect a preference for development standards that protect wetlands, wildlife, drainage, neighboring property values, and residential quality of life.

Conclusion

The April 22, 2026 survey packet documents a community with differing views regarding the need for and location of future commercial development. The overall survey response leaned against new commercial development within Rural Golden Gate Estates, while views regarding development outside the Estates were more evenly divided and somewhat more favorable. Immokalee Road and Immokalee Road/Wilson Boulevard emerged as the most frequently selected locations among respondents open to commercial development. Small neighborhood services, agricultural-related businesses, and grocery-anchored neighborhood centers received the greatest support.

The survey responses consistently emphasized rural character, traffic, environmental protection, safety, and development compatibility. The findings should be considered together with the official meeting record, future outreach, technical analyses, and broader Restudy policy discussions. Because the survey was voluntary and included a limited number of responses, it should be treated as a record of participant input rather than a statistically significant data set.

Appendices

Appendix A - Blank Commercial Development Preferences Survey Instrument
Appendix B - Completed Commercial Development Preference Surveys
Appendix C - April 22, 2026 Rural Golden Gate Estates Restudy Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Appendix D - Meeting Sign-In Sheet