

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
Naples, Florida  
November 21, 2024

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 9:00 a.m., in REGULAR SESSION in Building "F" of the Government Complex, East Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Chuck Schumacher, Acting Chairman  
Joe Schmitt, Chairman (attending remotely)  
Paul Shea, Secretary  
Randy Sparrazza  
Chuck Schumacher  
Michael Petscher  
Michelle L. McLeod  
Charles "Chap" Colucci  
Amy Lockhart, Collier County School Board Representative

ALSO PRESENT:

Raymond V. Bellows, Zoning Manager  
Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning Director  
Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Managing Assistant County Attorney  
Derek Perry, County Attorney's Office  
Ailyn Padron, Management Analyst I  
Oscar Alonso, Specialist III

PROCEEDINGS

MR. BOSI: Chair, you have a live mic.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Bosi.

Good morning, welcome.

Everybody please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Great. Thank you, everyone, for attending our November 21st, 2024, Planning Commission meeting.

Is Chair Schmitt on the phone?

MS. PADRON: Yes, he is.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: He is?

Chair Schmitt will be attending by audio today. I will need a motion to approve that, please.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: So motioned.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Second.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: (No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Excellent.

Secretary Shea, roll call, sir.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Chairman Schmitt, he's here.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: He's here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Vice Chair Schumacher?

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Second Shea is here.

Commissioner Sparrazza?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Commissioner Colucci?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Commissioner McLeod?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Commissioner Petscher?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Ms. Lockhart?

MS. LOCKHART: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: We have everyone here, and a majority. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Great. Everybody in attendance.

Addenda to the agenda, Mr. Bellows.

MR. BELLOWS: For the record, Ray Bellows. We have no changes to the agenda today.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, sir.

Next item, Planning Commission absences. I think our -- when is our next meetings, two meetings?

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director.

The December 5th meeting we canceled at the last -- there was no petitions on it, and the Planning Commission -- so it's December 19th is the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: December 5th is canceled?

MR. BOSI: December 5th is -- you guys canceled that last meeting.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I didn't hear it.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: I didn't remember that.

MR. BOSI: We did.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Okay.

MR. BOSI: Well, you guys did.

The question we have for you, after the 19th of December, the next meeting scheduled is January 2nd. Does the Planning Commission want to hold a meeting on January 2nd or -- right now we only have one tentative petition that is scheduled for -- potentially scheduled for it. We can move that to the January 16th item if the Planning Commission does decide that they -- it's too close to the holidays -- and because of travel, things like that, I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: For one -- for one petition, it doesn't seem like it's worth pushing the holiday, does it?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Right. Do you know how many so far are even tentative for the 16th?

MR. BOSI: For the 16th, I don't think we have any right now that are scheduled.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Sounds like we have one.

MR. BOSI: Yes. Yes. If that's the -- if that's the will, it sounds like the -- but it would take a motion for the Planning Commission to officially cancel the January 2nd meeting.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Let's start with the December 19th meeting.

Is -- can everyone attend the 19th, or is anyone going to be --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Good.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: -- traveling prior to the Christmas holiday?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: I'll be traveling; Colucci.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Colucci will be out. Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So we should have a quorum.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Chuck, I don't know if you can hear me. I'll be there in December.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Okay. Chair Schmitt will be here. Okay, great. So we'll have one absence.

And then the January 2nd meeting, can we get a motion to cancel that meeting?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: So motioned to cancel January 2nd, 2025, CCPC meeting and move the proposed agenda item to the January 16th meeting.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Can I get a second?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.  
CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Aye.  
COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.  
COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.  
COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.  
COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.  
CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Excellent.

\*\*\*Next item will be approval of minutes, November 7th, 2024, meeting minutes. Everybody had a chance to review them? If there's any edits or changes, please say so. If not, I'll take a motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: So motion to approve the current meeting minutes as they stand.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Can I have a second, please.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Second.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Excellent.

\*\*\*Next Item, BCC report. Mr. Bellows.

MR. BELLOWS: Yes. On November 12th, the Board of County Commissioners heard the PUD amendment with companion Growth Management Plan amendment and the development order amendment for the Tollgate PUD. That's where they were adding some -- or converting a hotel into some rental apartments. That was approved on their summary agenda.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Great.

\*\*\*Chairman's report. Chairman Schmitt, did you have anything you'd like to report, sir?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Nothing to report. My apologies to my colleagues. I'm sorry, I'm en route to Miami. I will definitely be there for the next meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: If anything, I feel bad for you having to drive to Miami.

All right. Consent agenda, I don't think we have anything on consent.

MR. BELLOWS: No.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: No, sir. Great.

\*\*\*All right. Moving right into public hearings, the first one, PL20220006931, Metro South.

Please rise to testify. Please be sworn in, all those who wish to speak on the matter.

THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

(The speakers were duly sworn and indicated in the affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Good morning, sir. The floor is yours.

MR. COPPER: Good morning, everyone. My name is Brandon Copper with Davidson Engineering, and I'm here to present the Metro South mixed-use project.

In attendance, we have myself along with the property owner and developer, Mr. Daniel Dufault.

So the site's located at 3010 Tamiami Trail, approximately 500 feet from the Bayshore Drive intersection with the East Trail. For those of us that have been in town for a while, we might recognize it as the old Pizza Hut site.

The underlying zoning is C-3, which allows for a variety of commercial uses, as well as a small portion of it is MH, for mobile home. We're seeking the MUP which allows up to 12 units per acre for this site at .64 acres. That's a total of eight units. To get the eight units, we're requesting seven bonus density units as well as utilizing the one unit that we're entitled to by right. We want to acknowledge that through the limited density bonus pool allocation, we will be contributing 5 percent of the engineer's opinion of probable cost at the time of SDP.

Surrounding uses: To the west and north we have some commercial; to the south and east, we have the existing mobile home park; and just beyond that we have more commercial.

Our proposed development will include the existing real estate office that's freshly renovated. It's about 2,500 square feet. The proposed mixed-use structure is five floors. First floor being about 1,300 square feet of commercial use. Floors 2 through 5 above will be residential as well as a rooftop with a pool and sundeck.

Per the LDC, we want to recognize that we do conform with this particular code that does not allow more than one use to take up more than 80 percent of the gross floor area. For our development, we'll have about 25 percent of the commercial use and then 75 residential.

The criteria for the MUP approval, one states that no less than 60 percent of the commercial uses shall provide retail, office, or personal services. We're providing 100 percent of our commercial uses to be office.

Number 2 is no more than 25 percent of the residential uses can be beyond a gate. We're not proposing any sort of gates, and the second stipulation of that is residential uses must be constructed along with the commercial component, and that is exactly what we're planning to do. We're not going to phase this project whatsoever.

Item No. 3, mixed-use projects shall connect to local streets and adjoining neighborhoods. We're proposing multiple sidewalk connections for pedestrians on the existing sidewalk along Tamiami Trail, as well as our driveway connection along Tamiami Trail. There is a private drive to the east of our project, which we do not have access to connect to.

And No. 4, the commercial component of the mixed-use project must be located internal to the site as to not promote strip development, and that's, as you will see, exactly what we have proposed.

Items No. 5 and 6 don't apply to our site just because of our site being less than five acres in size.

Here's our proposed site plan. To the east you'll see the existing about 2,500-square-foot commercial structure, and to the west you'll see our proposed building. What you're seeing in purple is the ground floor structure with some covered parking as well as covered walkways. The kind of crosshatch there is our commercial component there, so you have about four units inside the primary one along with a secondary fifth unit to the south there.

Our buffering plan, we're meeting the code minimum LDC for buffering. So on the west side you have a 10-foot Type A, on the north you have a 20-foot Type D, and on the east and south sides you have a 15-foot-wide Type B with a wall, and I went ahead and highlighted that wall for you.

Oh, here we go. Here's our typical floor plans. Starting from the right, you'll see our ground floor, which is the commercial component, and then to the left you'll see the typical floor plan for the residential units above. Again, two units per floor, four floors, for a total of eight.

Here's our rooftop plan. You see an amenity, such as a pool, sundeck, a mechanical room, as well as an elevator and stairwells.

And here is the elevation section of the building. At this point in time I think it would be good to recognize that we are seeking one deviation, and that is for the first floor of the structure. The code requires it to be 14 feet tall. We're requesting that to be down to 12 feet. And what we did is we took that extra height and distributed it amongst the residential floors above.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: So would you be going, like, 10-foot ceilings versus 8-, is that what you're doing, or 9-foot?

MR. COPPER: Right now they're 10-foot-9 from floor to ceiling. So I would imagine you would need room for some mechanical equipment beyond that.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Good.

MR. COPPER: And at this time, I'd like to open up the floor for any questions or discussion.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Sparrazza.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thank you.

Just a quick question, if you can back up to the floor plans that showed -- right there. Is there a pedestrian walk-through between, shall we say, the commercial building on the -- what would that be? -- north and the commercial on the south; is that what that hashmark --

MR. COPPER: Correct. The hashmark is kind of the walkway area that you're seeing there.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay.

MR. COPPER: So you can essentially transition from one floor to where you park to the opposite side, to that stairwell, to get out through the sidewalk that way as well.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: That's what I figured from the front elevation, but thanks for the clarification. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner McLeod.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Vice Chair? Vice Chair, I have a question.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Go ahead, Chair.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: If I may, the plan certainly indicates that the existing commercial building will remain. Now, with this rezoning, I just want to make clear for the record that at some time, based if the zoning is approved, you could have the option of razing that building and constructing a new building. Would there be any prohibition against that?

Because you indicate that the -- you indicate that the existing building is remaining, but the zoning certainly allows for the use again, and I just want to make it clear that at some time, if the existing zoning -- if it's approved, you may -- you could have the option to raze that building and build something comparable in that same area; is that correct?

MR. COPPER: I believe -- if you don't mind -- that we are limited to a certain amount of square footage, which is clearly defined in the MUP rezone. So while I think that potentially in the future if the building needs to be removed and replaced, that we would be limited to that amount of square footage; is that correct?

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: That's what I assumed. And I'll wait for Mike to answer. But, I mean, that's the old Pizza Hut building, and it's certainly -- it's probably been up for well over 35, 40 years. And I just want to make sure that our zoning staff makes it clear to the public that there are potentially -- or there is a potential that there could be a change, as long as you stay within the limits.

Go ahead, Mike. Sorry.

MR. BOSI: No, sorry -- sorry, Chair.

Mike Bosi again, Planning and Zoning director.

The applicant and Joe are correct; Chairman Schmitt is correct. They'll be able to rebuild the building within the -- within the square foot it allowed by this MUP.

MR. COPPER: And our client, to that point, has just made a significant investment in renovating that structure, so I don't believe that that is on your mind right now. He has confirmed "no."

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: That was an exhausted "no."

MR. DFAULT: Yeah.

MR. COPPER: It looks beautiful.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner McLeod. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: That's okay. That was one of my questions, too, what the plans were for the existing building, whether it was going to be razed or re-purposed, and it sounds like there's no immediate plans for it right now, I guess.

MR. COPPER: No. And a part of his renovation, he did flood-proof it, so it meets current code.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. And then another question I had, these units, are they owner-occupied, or are they going to be rental units?

MR. DFAULT: Owner occupied.

MR. COPPER: Owner occupied.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. The only concern I have on this -- I really like this project, and I especially liked that it was unanimously voted by the CRA to recommend support of the project. But there's only one ingress and egress from 41. I wish that -- and I had talked to staff about this -- some sort of secondary access point to the property. And then in looking at this, on the east side, that's where your existing building is right now. But would there have been a way of allowing for different access on that side instead of just one in and out from 41?

MR. COPPER: So are you speaking on just south of the exist building, the east?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So next door to it, it's -- River Drive, I believe, is on --

MR. COPPER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: -- the one side.

MR. COPPER: Yeah. And that's the private drive, so we don't really have an opportunity to connect to the private drive.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And then I know that the gas station to the west is closed, and perhaps maybe in the future if there was something there, maybe to tie in. Just my

thoughts.

MR. COPPER: It was a consideration. I mean, we just didn't find any way to make it, like --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Work at this time?

MR. COPPER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Yeah, those are my only questions.

MR. COPPER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Any public speakers on this matter?

MR. ALONSO: Can you hear me? Perfect.

No, no public speakers this morning.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: No public speakers. Okay. That being said, I will close this section -- go ahead, Mike.

MR. BOSI: And just from a staff report perspective, as contained in the staff report, staff is supporting. This is the type of mixed-use project that the Bayshore CRA would like to see more of, so we're fully supportive. And I did want to call out that the applicant made the statement at the very beginning that they were going to provide a 5 percent contribution of the engineer's probable cost.

What that is is the Bayshore has a public-realm improvement fund, and the public-realm improvement fund says that if you're going to utilize any of the bonus densities within the density pool that you have to contribute 5 percent of the cost of your overall engineer's probable cost of your project to the Bayshore public realm fund, and that's for accumulating revenues to provide for additional public-realm improvements, such as streetscapes, public art, various street lighting, sidewalk improvements, a variety of infrastructure projects that are intended to help raise the overall built environment within the -- within the CRA. So another significant public benefit that's associated with the proposal. I just wanted to call that out.

But as I said, staff is recommending approval, and any questions that you may have for staff, we'd be more than happy to address them.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: What's the probable cost?

MR. COPPER: We haven't got that far yet.

MR. BOSI: Those are provided at the Site Development Plan, I believe. When they get to Ms. Cook's shop, they will have the probable costs. But it's unknown right now.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: But it's the total cost of the project?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Okay. That being said, Board discussion? Any comments? Questions? No?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: If there is no comments or questions for the petitioner or for staff, I'll entertain a motion to approve or disapprove.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I'd like to move forward with a motion to approve this amendment. I've got to get the number.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: PL --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: PL20220006931 with no special --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Alterations.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yeah, no special comments or alterations to the submitted plan.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Okay. I'll take a second.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Motion approved unanimously. Thank you.

MR. COPPER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Before I close this matter, I do have one matter of housekeeping. I do need an ex parte disclosure as to this agenda item please, starting with Ms. McLeod. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Visited the site and reviewed the petition with the staff.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Viewed staff reports.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Staff reports only.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Staff reports only.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Staff reports only.

MS. LOCKHART: Staff reports only.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: I also reviewed -- Chair Schmitt, do you have any ex parte?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Staff reports only.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

Myself, staff reports and conversation with Mike Bosi.

Great. That matter's now closed.

\*\*\*Moving on to the next item with PL20230016211. It's the 5396 Myrtle Lane, which has a companion item, PL20230016212, which is a PUD RL for 5396 Myrtle Lane.

Starting with the Planning Commission, ex parte disclosures, starting with Commissioner McLeod.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Visited the site, I reviewed the petition with the staff, and I spoke with Jacob Winge, the past president of the East Naples Civic and Commerce group.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PESTCHER: I visited the site, I reviewed the staff reports, and I had a conversation with Richard Yovanovich.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Staff reports and conversation with Mr. Yovanovich.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Secretary Shea?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Staff reports.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Staff reports.

MS. LOCKHART: Staff materials only.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Chair Schmitt?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: For me, staff reports, and I spoke with Rich

Yovanovich as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Staff report, conversation with Mike Bosi, and a telephone conversation with Rich Yovanovich.

All right. Whoever will be speaking on this matter, please stand to be sworn in.

Thanks, Rich. I didn't know to do that. I appreciate the action, though.

THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

(The speakers were duly sworn and indicated in the affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Good morning, sir.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Good morning. For the record, Rich Yovanovich on behalf of the petitioner.

With me today is Mr. Starkey, the representative of the applicant. Mr. Arnold is our professional planner, and Mr. Delate is our civil engineer. Mr. Trebilcock is our traffic consultant, and Marco Espinar is our environmental consultant.

The property that we're going to be discussing today is an approximate 8.24-acre parcel of land located along the East Tamiami Trail. And as you can see on the screen, we have Broward Street across the street, and there's a traffic signal in this location. And when we show you the master plan, you'll see how we're providing a connection to that traffic signal for the individuals who live on Myrtle Lane as well as there's development over here that would have the ability to get to that traffic signal. That condition has been in the existing PUD and is being carried forward in this proposed PUD for the property.

The property is about seven acres that is existing, a commercial PUD, and 1.2 acres, which is an existing RMF-6 parcel. As your staff report indicated, these parcels were deemed consistent by policy. When the Growth Management Plan was originally adopted in 1989, we went to this activity center concept where commercial was supposed to be located in the four quadrants around major intersections and strip commercial that you commonly find around East Tamiami Trail and North Tamiami Trail is not favored under the Growth Management Plan, and there are incentives to redevelop this property for other uses other than commercial.

In our particular case, we're staying with the commercial, but under the existing Growth Management Plan we could get to 16 units per acre on this piece of property, plus the commercial that would be under the commercial property, plus another seven units on the multifamily. So we could put a 120-unit multifamily project on this particular piece of property under the existing Growth Management Plan.

What we're proposing is to make some changes to the Growth Management Plan to basically allow for indoor self-storage and for the rental of U-Haul trucks. The other commercial uses that we're requesting are pretty much already allowed in the growth -- in the existing PUD.

We're doing this with two petitions. We're doing a Small-Scale Growth Management Plan amendment, which means that it's less than 50 acres, and the process means there is one review at the county and then it's transmitted to the State for their comments.

That process was basically added to the state statutes several years ago because in counties like Collier County, if you look at our urban area -- which I don't know if you've seen the Future Land Use Map yet. I don't -- if I'm telling you things you already know -- and this is mainly for the new people -- under the -- or the new members. We have an urban area under our Growth Management Plan, and that urban area, if you look at it, is pretty much from Collier Boulevard west to the gulf and basically Immokalee Road south to the water as well.

That area, if you look at it, is -- the bigger parcels are gone. They've been zoned. They've been accommodated. So there's a process, basically, to amend the Growth Management Plan to address smaller infill parcels, because the bigger policies in the Growth Management Plan really don't translate to development of smaller parcels like an 8-acre or a 10-acre parcel.

So you will see in our Growth Management Plan several subdistricts, and you'll probably see me come up here with Mr. Arnold or other consultants on smaller infill parcels and say, "We'd like to do a Small-Scale Growth Management Plan," and we'll do a concurrent PUD rezone typically at the same time so you basically see exactly how the property's going to be developed, because the current regulations really do not work for these smaller parcels of property.

So that's what -- the first petition is a Small-Scale Growth Management Plan amendment, and the second petition is basically to rezone the property to PUD.

The existing zoning allows for 61,000 square feet of commercial and office uses, and we're making those changes that would allow us to have basically 200,000 square feet of indoor self-storage. And within that 200,000 square feet, we can have 3,000 square feet of retail uses as well as U-Haul trucks and some charging stations for electric vehicles.

So we're taking the operations that are the current U-Haul site, which is roughly a 1-acre site, moving it to this piece of property, and meeting all the architectural standards for commercial buildings on this piece of property.

So that's pretty much what the petition is requesting. We're not asking for any deviations from the code. We were originally asking for some deviations, and in meeting with staff -- and Wayne will get into this, and I talked to Mr. Bosi about this a little bit. Your staff report is asking us to do a Type B buffer along U.S. 41.

A typical buffer along the street is a Type D buffer. The difference mainly is how tall you grow the hedge. In a Type B buffer, which is usually adjacent to residential, and that's what we have. Adjacent to residential, you grow the hedge to six feet. In a Type D buffer, you grow the hedge to three feet.

So what we're asking for is to put in larger trees in the Type B buffer so it's an enhanced Type B buffer, and we're putting in additional palm trees in between the canopy trees that are included in our Type D buffer, which are larger than the canopy trees in the Land Development Code. So when you see the Type D enhanced buffer, that's what we're proposing along U.S. 41.

And I'm sure during the staff report Mr. Bosi will tell you that -- upon further discussion, that our proposed enhanced Type D buffer is appropriate along U.S. 41.

This is just the existing Future Land Use Map and our proposed -- or actually it's our proposed GMP designation -- Growth Management Plan designation for the property, and you can see what I basically described. We're asking for 200,000 square feet, 3,000 square feet of which is allowed for retail and the rental of the U-Haul trucks and outdoor and other allowed uses as part of our amendment.

This is the existing zoning map that I already took you through where you have our existing CPUD and our multifamily site that will become one PUD.

That's the overall request that you have before you, the two petitions.

I'm going to turn it over to Wayne Arnold to take you through the existing master plan and the zoning and our proposed changes to the master plan and discuss the buffers, and then after that, we'll be done with our presentation and available to answer any questions you may

have.

Overall, what we're proposing is a significant reduction from traffic in this area. Self-storage basically generates very little traffic. The existing commercial can generate significantly more traffic than we're proposing, and clearly, a residential project 120 units in size would be significantly more traffic than what we're proposing today with these changes to the Growth Management Plan as well as the PUD.

If you don't have any questions for me, I'll turn it over to Wayne. But when Wayne's done, the entire team is here to answer any questions you may have, if you don't have any questions for me at this time.

Mr. Arnold.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Hold on one second, Mr. Yovanovich.

MR. YOVANOVICH: So close.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Colucci.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: This is just for clarification.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Sure.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Take me to the corner of 41 and Collier Boulevard.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Take you to the corner -- I don't have a picture of it.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: That's where I am. Where is this site?

MR. YOVANOVICH: This site is to the west going towards the city, almost across from -- do you know where Lely Resort is?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Yeah.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Okay. It's a little bit further to the east -- no, west, right? A little further -- you'll learn, Mr. Colucci, that I'm directionally challenged, so I always look for confirmation on my directions. A little bit west of Lely Resort. I think Broward Street is the entrance to Lely High School, if you're familiar with the road that you take off of 41 to go to Lely High School. So it's a little bit east Lely Resort.

About how many miles is it from the intersection?

It's about a mile west of the intersection.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay. And where is the nearest residential neighborhood as it relates to this site?

MR. YOVANOVICH: If you see right here -- right here --

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Right.

MR. YOVANOVICH: -- that's the -- that's residential, that goes, I guess, west on Myrtle, so there's residential right here.

And Mr. Arnold will take you through our master plan to show you that. And then there's some multifamily down here.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Okay. We could -- we could put -- if you want -- yeah, why don't we put a larger aerial on the visualizer for you, if that will help you, Mr. Colucci. Put that in a little bit better perspective. If you can see -- I guess this isn't going to do any good. Do you see where it says "Myrtle Lane?"

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Yes.

MR. YOVANOVICH: That's residential, and then Treetops is residential, and to the east is Naples Manor, and further east is the high school I was just describing.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Can I assume you're going to have some input or comments from the residents who live here?

MR. YOVANOVICH: I think they're right over there (indicating), so...

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay. Thank you.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Yeah. We had comments at the neighborhood information meeting.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner McLeod.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: While we had that map up, to the east or southeast of the Myrtle Lane community, do we know what's planned for that area? I think I saw on a different map -- I think it was Page 6 of the 21-page report -- it was, like, sectioned off almost as if it was in lots.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Are you talking just to the left of where it says "Treetops Drive"?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right, yes.

MR. YOVANOVICH: That big vacant area?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yes.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I don't know the answer to that right now, but -- oh, I wasn't sure if Heidi was --

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi.

The zoning for that area, that undeveloped area, is agriculture. And they are -- but it is parceled off into smaller parcels than the required five acres. So they're probably legal nonconforming lots there. But it's -- it's in waiting for development, I think, to arrive.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right. Okay. So potentially it could be another community, a big community?

MR. BOSI: The designation from the Future Land Use Map is urban residential, so a residential use would be something that would be promoted currently by the Growth Management Plan --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay.

MR. BOSI: -- as appropriate for that location.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Anything else?

(No response.)

MR. YOVANOVICH: Okay.

MR. ARNOLD: Good morning. I'm Wayne Arnold, a certified planner with Grady Minor & Associates, and I'll walk you through the rest of our presentation.

So as Rich mentioned and you see on the current zoning exhibit, we have surrounding commercial to the north and east, and then you have additional commercial along U.S. 41, and then we have the residences along Myrtle Lane. And just, you know, as you saw in the other aerial photograph, I think there were 35 or 36 residences along Myrtle Lane.

So the existing approved master plan -- and north is to your right. This project was envisioned to be a 61,000-square-foot commercial planned development. There's the adjacent 1.2-acre residential multifamily site that we've added to this that comprises our 8.4-acre project.

And on this exhibit, you can see that it was proposed to have ingress and egress between Myrtle Lane and Tamiami Trail, which is the signalized access point at Broward Street that goes back to the Lely High School.

So for our revised plan for U-Haul -- and as Rich mentioned, this is a replacement site

for the U-Haul. I mean, most of you, I'm assuming, have been in town a long time. I've been here for 35 years. And the U-Haul facility that they have is sort of an outdated example of what U-Haul has been moving into, and they're calling themselves a mobility center. So it's about us being mobile. Ourselves are mobile. We move.

And so this will have a full service and/or self-storage facility that's a component of the type of U-Haul facilities as well as a one-story warehouse building that -- we're familiar with the pods. U-Haul has a U-Box concept. So if you need a personal moving opportunity, they can stack those on a truck and move you in a pod. You can put one in your driveway, et cetera. So it's part of the mobility.

They intend to provide propane sales, which is consistent with what they currently do at the location on the trail that's in the redevelopment area.

This site was identified because U-Haul is a growing enterprise. They're obviously a national company. They provide services throughout the country. And Collier County, obviously, has been the recipient of a lot of people moving into the area.

So this -- that area grows with our community. We've grown to the east, and this responds to that. And as I mentioned, to orient you on the site, we have a couple of easements that are being vacated, so we're showing those on the master plan. This existing easement also has a companion easement vacation that goes along with it.

When we originally spoke to the neighborhood information meeting, we depicted three buildings on this site. U-Haul has eliminated one of those buildings in favor of the larger indoor self-storage building. This would have the 3,000 square feet of retail, which if you've been to a U-Haul facility, you can buy boxes there, you can buy tape, you can buy packing supplies, things that go along with that. And so that would be a component of what they do in the 3,000 square feet of the facility.

The U-Box warehousing building would be in this location, and then the vehicles that they would lease would be throughout the site.

One of the things that we originally proposed was to eliminate the ingress to Myrtle in favor of just an emergency access only at this location. And the residents at the neighborhood meeting as well as staff suggested that we go back and live with the current condition of the PUD which says that we will provide a means of getting the community from Myrtle over to the signal at Broward. So we've depicted a conceptual alignment for that. That has a condition in the PUD that essentially mirrors what was there previously with additional verbiage that the County Attorney's Office added, but it guarantees that we will provide public access through the site and that that identified access will be identified at the time of site plan approval when all the engineering details are worked out.

It's not going to be a road. It's not meant to be a road. It's going to be an ingress/egress easement for the community to utilize to get from Point A to B, and it's going to be probably more similar to some of the parking lot interconnections that we're all familiar with around town or as we travel. It's not going to be a dedicated through road. I mean, that would bifurcate the site and not really make it conducive to what U-Haul wants to do with the site, but we will be providing that access point.

Rich mentioned a couple things on our buffer, and I just wanted to be a little bit more clear. So we have what we're calling an enhanced buffer along Myrtle and along our U.S. 41 frontage. And I think there was some misconception on the county's landscape architecture's part, because we weren't attempting to eliminate any of the canopy trees. In fact, we've provided for up-sized canopy trees at the time of planting at 14 feet, which is above your code

minimum requirement. And in addition to that, we wanted to plant these palm clusters that would give an additional layering of buffer along that corridor but in no way eliminating those.

In your code -- I think the confusion was your code allows us, typically, to transplant three palm trees for one canopy tree. Our intent is not to eliminate any of the canopy trees. It's to add the additional palm trees. And the idea with the Type B versus D -- I know some of it's new nomenclature for you, but as Rich mentioned, the Type D buffer is what's normally found along a right-of-way, and where we have parking adjacent to that, we provide a hedge, and that hedge has to go in planted at two feet height, and it's intended to grow enough so that it shields headlights from pointing directly onto the road.

So the Type B buffer, which is what you typically put between commercial and residential, requires you to have a 6-foot-high opacity, and that can be a hedge, it can be a wall, or it can be a combination of a berm, a wall, and a hedge, but it mandates a 6-foot-high opacity. And for most business models, I don't think we want a wall in front of our site, and we certainly don't want to block to view of what's going on with signage and other things.

So we think the traditional buffer that we've offered to be enhanced is a good thing and a good compromise. There's going to be fill brought in on site, so it's not as if the headlights are going to be at the car level. There's going to be a few feet of fill brought in the site. Some of you were around a few months ago when we brought a new Home Depot along this corridor as well, and there was -- the same issue came up, and it was not warranted to put in a B buffer. It was warranted that the D buffer with some enhancements was adequate, and we think the same should be true here.

I have the language in the code. I can read it. And it was one of the conditions that we disagreed with for staff, and that was we think the D buffer is adequate. But the language -- and I'll read it slowly for Terri -- it says, "The 15-foot-wide Type D landscape buffers as shown on the master plan shall be enhanced above the LDC required buffer by having the required canopy trees a minimum of 14 feet tall at the time of planting, and palm tree clusters of staggered heights should be planted between the canopy trees for both U.S. 41 and Myrtle Lane buffers. The right-of-way canopy trees shall be native canopy trees, and palm trees may not be substituted."

And that's what I referred to, that we don't get the opportunity to say, well, our three palm trees count as a canopy tree. We have to put in the canopies, and we're enhancing it with the tree clusters. So I just want to make sure that's understood, and I think Mike can address that as part of his presentation.

This is a very conceptualized rendering, but you can see in the foreground the intended warehouse building. We've sat down with your architectural reviewer. We originally thought we needed some deviations from the code. As it turns out, we do not, and so we have not proposed a deviation. When we first held our neighborhood information meeting, we've said that we thought we needed a deviation. We wanted to go through this alternate review process that the county offers, and it was determined we don't need that.

And you can kind of ignore the colorations. I see Mr. Shea, you know, sort of looking at that. And I think this is a conceptualized version. The "U" building would be back here where they would store the pods. And then, of course, we're depicting the enhanced buffer. And the palm trees don't really read well on this rendering, but these are canopy trees supplemented with those, and then there's a meandering hedge that goes along there as well.

And then what's depicted here is the signalized intersection at Broward, and that was intended -- and we think that FDOT will allow us to open that up to become a true signalized

intersection. So the Myrtle residents and other commercial users that are on Myrtle would have an access to come through the site to get out to the signalized intersection.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Mr. Arnold, can you keep that slide back up real quick?

MR. ARNOLD: Sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Secretary Shea.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yeah. I guess I'm having trouble visualizing how that -- passing through the site. So if I live on Myrtle and there's no light for me to go left on Tamiami, I can just drive through your site anywhere I want and go through your entrance so I can have access to Tamiami going east at the light?

MR. ARNOLD: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: It just seems like an accident waiting to happen. There's no control over somebody flowing through the yard and trucks moving around and being parked and --

MR. ARNOLD: Well, I think that's why the condition that was previously written and the condition as it's carried forward allows that to be better defined at the time of site plan approval. So we're going to have to depict where the storage of vehicles and those things occur versus the travel lane that will carry the traffic. Keep in mind that the traffic on Myrtle, those that would use it are the ones town bound. So left bound from Myrtle. There are 35 homes there. It's primarily built out, so you're not going to see a great number of additional homesites so that -- it's for those northbound movements which are probably fairly minimal. But there's also -- if you don't want to take advantage of the signal, you can go down and make a U-turn at the next signal just about a half a mile down the road.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Will you identify a pathway --

MR. ARNOLD: We will. And it's shown on --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: -- there like you do at airports for shuttle buses, that you stay in the lines, and --

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. I think what -- as I mentioned, you know, this isn't meant to be a road, and there's an exception, so we don't treat it as a roadway for setback purposes, et cetera. It's clearly -- it's very likely going to be a drive aisle that's part of our parking lot. And it will be defined that way, the "access to signal" or something.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Mr. Shea, we anticipate when the SDP comes through that we will actually mark it and put signage up to make sure those who are using it know where they're going. We don't -- we don't want them wandering through the site. We want it to be identified so that they can safely get to the traffic signal.

And I'll let you know, some people at the neighborhood information meeting wanted us to not have that access and others did want us to have that access, but ultimately Collier County staff said, "You will have that access," so we had -- we're carrying that forward. But it's in our interest to make sure that it's properly signed and marked so that the traveling public can get to that traffic signal.

MR. ARNOLD: And, Mr. Shea, I would just mention as well, this is not going to be a gated facility. U-Haul does not gate their facilities, so...

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Sparrazza.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thank you.

Back up to the conceptual, if you would, please. Thank you.

On the slide before it -- and maybe there's been modifications -- it's stated that the -- I'll

call it the most western property was a single story and that the other one, I'll call it the eastern, is a four-story. On the conceptual, they're both multistory. Is that just incorrect?

MR. ARNOLD: Well, let me clarify. So the building that's the traditional and/or self-storage that we're all accustomed to seeing, this rendering is for a three-story concept. It's still 200,000 square feet. We labeled it four-story because the height that we're suggesting, which is 50 feet, could accommodate a four-story self-storage building. So we've got 50 feet as our zoned height, which is consistent with the existing planned development that's there today, although that existing PUD says three stories and 50 feet.

So keep in mind now we deal with a zoned height and actual height, so we established our zoned height of 50 feet, which is consistent with that approved for today, and we established a maximum actual height of 60 feet.

But the -- and just to explain, then, on the -- with the U-Box building, it's depicted as a multistory building, and that addresses your glazing, but what it is, it's one single story where they can stack multiple pods on top of each other. So it's not really stories. It's got the vertical height in order to store those.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thank you.

And unfortunately, this rendering does not show the actual traffic light which, just for future, would help conceptualize that, "Oh, yes, there is now a four-way intersection going on on that rendering," so -- but thank you for your explanation.

MR. ARNOLD: Yep. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner McLeod.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Going back to the rendering, I see a lot of concrete space in between the two buildings. Why is there so much of a parking area there?

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. What's not depicted there are the vehicles that U-Haul -- the trailers and the trucks that you can go in and rent. So this is also going to have those types of uses. They just don't depict those in this rendering. This was meant to sort of show the landscaping and the bulk of the buildings.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So it's just going to have a lot of cars there, trucks?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, it will have trucks and trailers.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And then along the lines of -- if it's okay to ask -- continue to ask.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. The buffer, the landscape that you were mentioning, when you talk about canopy trees and palm trees, my concern is you still see through all of that and you see trucks. Can you go back to what you were saying on the hedges? Is there something that can hide what's back there?

MR. ARNOLD: Well, I don't think you're ever going to hide everything that's in a parking lot. But keep in mind that the site today is undeveloped. It's low, so there's going to be fill brought in.

So if you're in the travel lane of U.S. 41, the actual elevation that gets developed is going to be a few feet higher than is there today, and then on top of that, you plant a couple-foot-high hedge that gets maintained at two to three feet in height typical, and that's high enough. Most -- if you drive down the highway, that's high enough to shield car lights. Maybe not every truck light. But, you know, the idea isn't to hide everything that's going on on the site. It's really to take away. And we think the -- it's to take away the headlight glare, but in this case, between the extra palm trees, the higher trees, and the hedge, we think that

layering effect is perfectly adequate.

And I would also say that, you know, it's not a really good comparison to look at their site that we're all familiar with back toward the Davis Boulevard intersection, because, you know, if you've been around long enough, U.S. 41 didn't always look like that. That property, as well as the Thalheimer Gallery, if you've been around long enough, and all of those properties where the mini golf is, they had a huge right-of-way taking. It took away all of their prior buffering.

So that's why their vehicles seem to be right on the back of the sidewalk, because they are. All the property that the State took from them, they were allowed to continue to use what they had. So that's why the building and the improvements are so close to the right-of-way in that location.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: The reason why I asked about the buffers, I'm really mostly concerned about the residents when they want to go for a walk. There's a sidewalk in front of this. I would just like them to see beautiful foliage and not trucks. That was my concern.

MR. ARNOLD: Okay.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I just want to point out, one of the current allowed uses on this site is a car dealership. So that development would result in more cars, more trucks sitting on this piece of property than reality is from what we're requesting.

This will be a much -- it will be a nice buffer, but there's nothing we can do to avoid their being able to see the U-Haul trucks that are -- that -- candidly, U-Haul won't relocate if we were required to put in the 6-foot hedge along both sides of this. And you wouldn't have a 6-foot hedge if we built the car dealership, and you wouldn't have the enhanced buffer. You would have a typical buffer.

So I think the community is getting an enhancement through reducing the traffic and enhancing the buffers than they would get otherwise on this under the existing zoning.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Just one point, though, you know, cars versus U-Haul trucks with the signage is a little different.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I understand there's a -- but, you know, you could sell -- if you go to Tamiami Ford or anywhere else, they sell trucks as well. It's not just -- it's just not cars. There's other vehicles that you would see in a very cramped and crowded car dealership, along with other noisy things that would come along with that car dealership.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Colucci.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: You have to bear with me. I'm new.

MR. ARNOLD: Sure.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: So I've got to get used to some of these acronyms. What's on this parcel right now?

MR. ARNOLD: Today the parcel's actually a vacant piece of property, but it has zoning on it -- it has an RMF-6 zoning for about one acre of it, which is residential multifamily. That allows roughly six units per acre.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay.

MR. ARNOLD: And then it has a Planned Unit Development, which is a commercial plan development that allows 61,000 square feet of a variety of uses, including, as Mr. Yovanovich mentioned, a car dealership, other retail uses.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: So the answer is "nothing right now"?

MR. ARNOLD: It's a vacant piece of property today, yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay. The second thing I'd like to understand is the property -- the parcel's currently designated mixed -- Urban Mixed-Use District, correct?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, it's part of the Urban Mixed-Use --

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: So that allows for a car dealership, right? I think that's what I just heard.

MR. ARNOLD: The current zoning does permit for a car dealership, yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: So it permits a car dealership but not a storage facility?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay. Well, I've learned something. Thank you.

MR. ARNOLD: Since our code was written many years ago, what we now know as self-storage has evolved dramatically and, you know, these have become more office building looking things. They're not relegated to industrial parks as they used to be. So that's one of the big differences.

So as Rich mentioned, we've got a list of uses that these mostly relate to allowing us to have some of the same C-1 through C-3 uses in the 3,000 square feet because of the variety of retail uses that U-Haul tends to sell in addition to, then, the leasing and the storage for their cube storage and moving.

As I mentioned, we establish development standards as part of every plan development. Most of the time we focus on, you know, the setbacks and the height. I talked about the height. The current zoning on the property would allow the 50 foot zoned height. We've carried forward that same request for 50 feet of zoned height, and then an actual height of 60. The 60 -- for those that are maybe new to the code, you know, Rich coined the phrase, "It's the tippy top."

So the actual height is the highest of any embellishment that goes on your building. So if you decided to put a decorative tower element or something on the property, 60 feet is the highest part of any of that architectural embellishment. The zoned height is measured as to the roofline or the midpoint of the roof, depending on the type of roof. So that's the distinction, and back in the day we didn't have an actual height. It was only a zoned height.

Transportation -- Norm Trebilcock is here, who prepared the traffic analysis, but I think there's just a couple of major takeaways. One, we establish, as part of any new plan development, a trip cap, so it establishes the highest peak-hour trip cap, and that's the first bullet point. It's 62 two-way p.m. peak-hour trips. You know, if you go to the second bullet point, it's 238 trips associated with what's allowed today on the site. If they develop the 61,000 square feet of retail uses, that would equate to 238 peak-hour trips. So that's a 380 percent reduction -- or 380 percent higher trip rate than we're proposing.

So, I mean, that's kind of the key component here. The other component is we're opening up an access point at the Broward intersection which we think benefits the Myrtle Lane traffic as well as our commercial use.

And in sort of conclusion, this is replacing the antiquated site that we have that's in the Bayshore/Gateway Triangle area. We're providing the signalized access. We've committed to the enhanced buffers. We're addressing the demand. And one of the things I didn't really touch on, but it's in the Growth Management Plan application, we have to do a market needs analysis to demonstrate that there is demand for additional self-storage.

U-Haul isn't in the business of losing money, I can assure you, so U-Haul has analyzed

this site as well as others in the areas, their competitors, as well as other vacant sites to determine whether or not this is a feasible site. They think it is. They're excited about the site. So we've demonstrated that there is a market demand for that.

And as I said, we certainly support the recommendation of approval by staff. I think our disagreement is in the Condition 1 that references a Type B buffer versus Type D buffer, and we hope you can support our request for the Type D buffer.

With that, I'll answer any other questions, or Norm or our team can answer.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Vice Chair, it's Commissioner Schmitt. I have a couple questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Please go, Chair.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yeah.

One is, Wayne or Rich, just for the record, can you state any cost associated with modifying the traffic signal, that being the replacement of mast arms or any other cost? That will be solely at the petitioner's requirement to pay for that, not the county. Can you -- is that correct?

MR. ARNOLD: Mr. Schmitt, this is Wayne Arnold. I don't think we have a definitive cost estimate, but as you're probably aware, when you're dealing with mast arms and signal changes, it's probably several hundred thousand dollars associated with full service traffic signals, and those costs will be borne by the applicant. Those are not intended to be borne by the county.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: But, Wayne, there's no commitment for that, right? There's no commitment in the PUD for that?

MR. ARNOLD: No, there's no definitive commitment related to the signal cost.

MR. YOVANOVICH: We're happy to add that commitment. But, you know, we typically are required for all site-related improvements to be on our dime. So if you want to include that as one of the site-related improvements so there's no ambiguity, that's fine with us.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: That's their call for the Planning Commission. You stated that it was going to be your cost, and I just wanted to make sure they understood it was not in the PUD.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I understand, but I wanted for the newer members to understand that there are site-related costs that are the developer's cost, typically. So you're not going to see every site-related cost in a PUD document as a commitment. That's -- that's the only reason I wanted to bring that up.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Also, Rich, you've identified the Condition No. 2, but not Condition No. 1 of staff report. So if you could address that later on.

And sorry for the interruption, but I thought you'd like the clarification.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, I guess what -- we're not -- yeah, we're not -- we're not agreeing with either of the two staff recommendations regarding landscape buffers. And I'll let Mike address that. We're going to stick with the PUD as it was written -- written by us, just to clarify. Okay.

Thanks, Heidi.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yeah. Just to continue, and probably Norm would even be able to highlight even further. Considering this traffic light already exists, you're still going to have to go through the State. Whether it requires a new warrant for a light, I don't know. But regardless, all costs would be borne by the petitioner. So we can make that clear in the PUD.

The second question I have -- and I already spoke to Rich about this -- since there's going to be vehicles on site, I want to be very clear what maintenance would be allowed on site. What I don't want is a maintenance center for repairing trucks. That's not what was in the PUD or in the request. I can see and understand what I would call preventative maintenance checks and services, those kinds of things that you would do routinely daily, whether it's minor maintenance, but what should be prohibited on site is any major maintenance, whether, you know, brakes -- changing of brakes or those kind of things. All that kind of work of any of the requirements that -- required by U-Haul, those trucks would have to be moved off site to a proper maintenance facility.

Can you clarify for the record any maintenance requirements and hours of maintenance, those kinds of things, if there is any type of work like that that needs to be done on site.

Thank you.

MR. ARNOLD: Thanks.

Again, Wayne Arnold, Mr. Schmitt. And there is no intention to do any kind of major repairs here. Obviously, washing and detailing of the vehicles, probably some very minor repair, windshield washers, things like that. But there is no maintenance facility built into this plan whatsoever.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yeah. The only thing I would even think of is -- you know, that's exactly what you said, windshield -- windshield wiper; battery change, if needed; possibly even a flat tire repair. But anything beyond that, there -- it's not a maintenance facility, and any type of work that would be done would be done off site, not on that site. So we just want to make that clear for the record as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Great. Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner McLeod.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I have a question on noise. Should I ask that now?

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.

I live in Parkshore, in the city, and maybe, like, two streets off from 41. There used to be a huge car dealership on 41, and you could hear the operations on the car dealership. Like, you could hear people -- salespeople being called to the phone and things like that. "Tom Smith, you've got a call on Line 1." That car dealership is now gone, and now there's a Rooms to Go warehouse, and you don't hear the same kind of things.

My concern about this is noise to the neighborhood. Are we assured that there are no kind of outdoor loudspeakers, any kind of noise that would affect the neighborhood?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, I don't know if they have a speaker system to summon employees to come to the office or related to that. I don't know the answer to that, so I don't know. We could try to find out while the public is speaking.

What I would want to point out, that this is going to be a much quieter use than the car dealership that can currently go on that site.

There are no outdoor speakers. We're communicating with the U-Haul person as we speak.

This may be a good time for me to address something that you brought up regarding landscaping.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Uh-huh.

MR. YOVANOVICH: U-Haul is willing to maintain the hedge along Myrtle at the 6-foot height to keep in context with the residential character but will not agree to increase the

height along 41. So I hope -- I hope that addresses your concern about if the neighborhood is going on a walk down the residential street. It still will have basically the residential buffer that you would typically find and we do have along our residential boundary.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. YOVANOVICH: And we typically include a commitment in the PUD that says no outdoor speakers, so we'll have to add that, in case Heidi says it's not in the PUD. Because if not, we would have to add that. Hopefully that addresses your concern regarding noise.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right. Just as long as, you know, there's nothing out there that will disturb the neighborhood.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, I can't promise you --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Besides just the cars coming in and out.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I can't promise that. You know, there's -- you know, it's normal traffic. There's going to be -- this property's going to get developed at some point, so there's going to be noise from that site that's typically -- that's obviously not there today, but the uses that we're proposing are not noisy uses.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Sparrazza.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Hello, Rich.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Hello, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Quick question for you. I know some U-Haul facilities allow or provide for trailer hitch installation into personal cars. And if so, it does get somewhat complicated. They have to jack the car up. They have equipment that comes in. They do those installations, quote, on site. Is this option or business opportunity offered at this location?

MR. YOVANOVICH: It's currently -- I understand it's at the current, and we're anticipating doing it at this location as well.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: By any chance could that be done inside where the pods are located? Because this does start to -- all right, now we have somebody's van out in the parking lot lifted up, bolted in.

MR. YOVANOVICH: What I'm being told is that it's not a noisy operation, and they're not lifted up, and that, no, that -- the pod building is for storage. So relocating maintenance or that type of activity inside that pod building is not an option for us.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Do you know if there's an area dedicated for this type of trailer hitch installation that might not be seen easily, you know, on the back side of the main storage building?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, the -- where's the master plan. If you'll see, if it's going to occur, it's going to -- it's going to occur in an area, I would think -- obviously, it's not going to happen in the back because --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Right.

MR. YOVANOVICH: And this is the old-fashioned storage right here next to us, and in this area -- I mean, we could commit that it wouldn't happen here if that will help.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Well, that's pretty much a 6-foot fence anyway on the --

MR. YOVANOVICH: I'm just asking if -- I mean -- but it's -- I don't think at the end of the day what you're going to have -- now that you're going to have your 6-foot hedge along Myrtle, you're not going to really see it.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. Just -- I'm also putting in mind when folks, the few times a day it may happen, come off of Myrtle, go into the easement area to get to the traffic signal at Broward, where this operation may take place. Looking at safety and --

MR. YOVANOVICH: I'm sure all of that will be addressed when the site development --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Site development plan.

MR. YOVANOVICH: -- is actually approved.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. As long as we're aware of that, not --

MR. YOVANOVICH: This is not going to be --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: It doesn't happen often. I know that.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well -- but even then, it's not going to be -- it's not going to be a use on the site where all this activity's going to be happening all this time and, inconveniently, cars are going to be coming through to try to get to the traffic signal. All this will be addressed as part of the Site Development Plan.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Site Development Plan. Perfect. All right. Thank you. You've answered that. I appreciate it.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Anything else? Anybody else on our team?

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: I'll turn it over to Mr. Bosi.

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, again. Planning and Zoning director.

As contained within the GMP amendment as well as the rezone, the PUD rezone request, staff is recommending approval. We are modifying our recommendation or our additional conditions. What I've just heard from the applicant -- I think I would want to confirm with him -- that the -- I believe that they agreed that -- the buffer along Myrtle Lane, they would agree to the Type B buffer along Myrtle Lane.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Yeah. We'll agree to a B along Myrtle and enhanced D along 41.

MR. BOSI: And the enhanced D along 41, staff is supporting that arrangement.

If you can see, this is your type -- up here is your Type B buffer, so you have -- you have trees that are planted 25 feet on center and then a single row of hedge plantings that is to grow six feet.

The contrast from -- the contrast from the B buffer to the D buffer, which is here, is you've got trees that are 30 feet on center, and you have a double row of hedge that is maintained at three feet.

So what they're proposing on U.S. 41 is the D buffer, which is 30 feet with their canopy trees, and I think they agree that they're going to be canopy trees; they will not be replaced with palms or understory trees. They'll have a double row hedge that's going to be maintained at three feet as well as clusters -- three clusters of palms spaced in between the trees that are planted on 30 feet to provide for additional enhancement, and that arrangement staff -- staff would be supportive of.

We understand along the right-of-way for a commercial use the code requires just a simple Type D buffer. They're asking -- they recognize that there is concern about the visual impact of this site along the traveling public as well as pedestrians and bicyclists along that sidewalk that abuts the development, and we think the additional cluster enhancement of palms provides for additional softening of the viewshed.

And I think that was one area that still was in question related to what was being proposed and what was within the staff report. And based upon the conversation with

the -- that the applicant's presentation was, we can agree with the enhanced buffer along Myrtle, because that's the residential -- that's the street that leads to the residential development that's to the west.

And then on 41, the enhanced Type B, we think, provides for the adequate buffering and allows for this site to integrate with -- into the built environment in a more measured or at least appropriate way.

And any questions that you would have on any of the issues that we discussed today, staff would be happy to answer.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Mike, quick question. What type of signage is allowed on this site?

MR. BOSI: Well, it's -- the signage is going to be per code. They are not seeking any deviations that are -- that are contained within the PUD, so they have to maintain their signage per the Land Development Code.

And I couldn't tell you specifically the square footage of the signage, but what I can tell you is our signage code is not very liberal in terms of what it allows. It's pretty restrictive. And with no deviations being sought, there's no additional signs than what the minimum is required by -- or allowed by the code would be provided for.

And the square footage that's associated with it is not -- is not being requested above what the code requires. So in that regard, what this will -- this will play by the rules of every other commercial building.

And another thing that I want to point out, each one of the buildings that are on this site will be required to meet all of the architectural standards. There was no deviations that are being requested. So the full -- the arrangement of architectural embellishments will be imposed upon the structures that are being proposed.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Another question I had is, what could be built on this property right now without coming from before the Planning Commission?

MR. BOSI: I think Mr. Yovanovich has probably identified the one that would be maybe the least best fit for the neighborhood, it being a car dealership. But you could also have 60,000 or 62,000 square feet of commercial activity, and that commercial activity, though it is neighborhood serving and it's goods and services, it will have a higher degree of traffic that will be associated with it. So there's pros and cons to what could be developed or what is being proposed development.

I think from a transportation standpoint, it is a much welcomed reduction in terms of the overall trips that could be generated at this location. So for those reasons, you know, and other reasons, those are some of the factors that we looked at.

Another aspect, we do recognize that the location of the current U-Haul, you know, adjacent towards where the development of mini-triangle and the redevelopment effort that is happening right now, more to a centralized location further to the east is beneficial.

The one -- the one petition that you guys -- that the new Planning Commission got to hear so far was the AUIR at the prior meeting. And if you -- if you remember, I'm not sure if I highlighted to you, but the COs -- we had a map in there, and they showed the COs that have been issued from 2006 to 2023, and we've showed dots. And what you'll see is Immokalee Road, east of Collier Boulevard heading -- heading to the east and towards the Orangetree area is where you're seeing a tremendous amount of growth, but also the East Trail. The East Trail along -- down to Collier Boulevard, and then beyond Collier Boulevard is where you're seeing even more of new residential development popping up.

So what we're saying is you're seeing a migration of the moving facility from that constrained site to a site that has a little bit more flexibility, and it's large enough to be able to maintain the commitment to allow for the access from Myrtle to the light across the street to be able to provide that movement. So there are a number of larger public benefits that are being identified as well as some of the site specifics that we know that are needed to help mitigate the impacts to the existing residential neighborhood.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: And if something went in there other than a U-Haul, there's nothing that would make that developer, or whoever built it out, to allow access to Myrtle, for them to cut through to get to a light.

MR. BOSI: No. The commitment for -- the commitment to the light is currently in the existing PUD. So that -- whoever -- whatever was being proposed, transportation staff would say we need to maintain that commitment. So that -- that existed --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: It already existed.

MR. BOSI: The applicant has obviously agreed that they will allow for that type of access to the property.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: And I had read an e-mail where it seemed like -- the way it read to me was that the redevelopment on that triangle was kind of pushing U-Haul out.

And this is probably a question for Rich. No one's telling U-Haul you've got to move. Like, that owner of that property can stay there as long as he wants, correct?

MR. BOSI: As far as I know, they're -- I mean, not from a governmental standpoint. It's a use that's -- it's permitted by their zoning, so there's no governmental message that you need to leave because we want this site to redevelop. I think it's just market forces, probably, that are more of the things that are kind of urging that type of activity.

And I would like to point out from a staff perspective one other key aspect. And you mentioned -- we mentioned a little bit about it, and we talked about it during the rezoning for Home Depot, and it's the East Naples Development Plan. The East Naples Development Plan was accepted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2020, and that was a multiyear effort of us talking to the community, doing visual preference surveys, to see what would they like to see within this East Trail corridor to help provide more neighborhood and community serving type of uses.

And the end result of that -- of that study was they were -- the auto-oriented uses, they thought they needed some more design components to soften some of those, and they've incorporated some of these designs. But what they also did was identified community and regional centers along that trail, and this is one of the community centers.

What they would be proposing in the East Naples Development Plan, if it was fulfilled, would be a mixed-use site with the potential for 135 multifamily units as well as commercial development which is what's being promoted. And I think that could be a use. But one of the things that we would have to recognize is if that use was developed, the transportation impacts associated with that would be much greater than what's being proposed today.

So overall, we think this -- the proposal has been adjusted and designed to fit within the context of sitting on a six-lane divided highway but recognizing that we have a residential neighborhood to the south, and the design components in the arrangement of the buildings have been encouraged to recognize the sensitivity of that residential development that sits to the west.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Okay. Does anyone on the dais have any questions for Mike?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: No. How many public speakers do we have registered?

MR. ALONSO: We have two on site.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Just two?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: How many online?

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: How many -- well, how many in person and how many online?

MR. ALONSO: So none online but two so far on site. It looks like we need to have a few more fill out --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: We need to do a few more.

Let me ask the court reporter if it's okay if we recess now instead of 10:30 and allow these folks to fill out speaker slips.

MR. BOSI: Chair, and could I just -- for the public, if you would like to speak -- and it's my fault. I should have let you know at the very beginning. If you would like to speak, Oscar and Ailyn are in the back. They have speaker slips to fill out. So during the break, if you want to -- if you would like to speak and comment on the matter, go back there. They'll take care of you, and you'll have -- you'll have the opportunity to speak and have the Planning Commission hear your perspective.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: That being said, we'll go ahead and recess till 10:30.

(A brief recess was had from 10:18 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.)

MR. BOSI: Chair, you have a live mic.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you. Welcome back.

I'll ask everybody to take their seats, and we will move into -- well, first let me ask the Planning Commission if there's any questions for staff at this time.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: If not, I'll move into public comment.

MR. ALONSO: Hello. There we go. Okay. We have seven speakers, starting with Falconer Jones, and then followed by Gregory Vilks.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: I will say, as we get into public speakers, you're allowed five minutes to discuss the item. If, by chance, somebody gets up and says exactly what you were going to say, you don't have to use all five minutes. You can say, "I agree with what they said," and it counts just as much. So with that, I will turn it over to you.

Mr. Falcon; is that correct?

MR. JONES: No, Falconer, first name.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Falconer.

MR. JONES: I have two last names. I had nothing to do with it.

Thank you for letting me speak.

I've been a resident of Collier County for almost 50 years. Rich and I got chatting. You know, we know some of the same old-time guys that were around here. I was fortunate enough when I first came here to meet some of them. And most of them are gone now.

But my just -- my one thing is when I first came to Naples, I came down this road with my parents. I think the first traffic signal I saw was at the four corners, and it was a blinker, and it had a sign, "Beaches, four blocks."

But anyways, I've been around here a long time. I've actually had our attorneys, our architects, our engineers, our traffic people coming before not only the county for development -- because that's what I did. I did it in the city. I did it in the county.

The question I want to ask of you people today is why. Why are we trying to put this project on this site? Why did -- why are we moving the storage facility, the U-Truck [sic] facility down from an area where it's now becoming more residential, and we're now putting it on Myrtle Lane? I live on Myrtle Lane.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: It's not -- it's the petitioner that's doing it.

MR. JONES: My question is, why is -- why would we want to do it? Why would you -- why would that -- why would we want to do that as planners -- as planners? Why would we want to move a site that was -- it is becoming more residential downtown on the five corners and put it in a residential area, which is Myrtle Lane?

Why would I want to drive through their site to get to my house at night? She had a very good point. There's only one access in and out of Myrtle Lane. This is on other sites along 41 that there's multiple ways to get out of the development, including Treviso Bay, the Isles of Collier, and all of the developments on the other side.

So that's my question. Why? Why are we trying to take a site that has a road that has -- that's going to go right through to the traffic light and try to make it something that it isn't? That's my point. I have nothing more to say.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Well, thank you, sir.

MR. ALONSO: Our next speaker's going to be Gregory Vilk, followed by Claudia Fuller.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Gregory. I know you've been sworn in. Sir, have you been sworn in?

MR. VILK: I actually stood up on the first batch, on the first run.

So good morning. Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity.

I'm going to try to get through my five minutes. I had pre-done notes, but there's 10 items I'd like to probably disclose, especially the question that was asked about the land -- the acreage land that was identified as agricultural. And I'd like to talk about that after I get through my initial so the Board at least understands.

The current U-Haul property sale, if it does happen, is not a transfer to be considered under any duress. In fact, such sale would be a favorable transaction to all parties involved. So wanting to come down to Myrtle Lane is a choice, not an eminent domain, not a public community benefit.

The existing zoning use allocated to each parcel on Myrtle Lane or the subject property should never ever be reduced or limited against the property owner's rights, or the zoning.

I'm a hard believer of property owner rights, their use and their privileges. Never ever restrict them. That's my belief. I also don't believe you should gift or grant an opportunity to another party when it becomes a hardship or a burden on the community or the neighborhood.

Residents that were obviously able to make it here today and/or to be present in the prior library are here. Many of them do work, so they couldn't be here, but I think we do have a good showing.

The existing U-Haul business near Davis does not currently have storage capacity, which has also always been -- at least 12 years that I've been a full-time resident has always been an eyesore to the community.

The existing business does not need any gratuity from the county off the backs of the residents to operate under the same or excessive additional conditions, use, or services. They are a for-profit business. They clearly told us they're here for profit.

The current U-Haul property sale is nothing more than an accelerated opportunity for

financial gain and benefit to each party which the nonconforming parcels on Myrtle Lane don't qualify certainly either as a hardship or a gift. Any approval here to modify or change the current or existing zoning use would represent, in my opinion, a plain act of privilege to a business knowing there shall be harm to the neighboring residents, traffic flow, and literally a sledgehammer to the so-called commissioner's desire to pause and/or have a moratorium on self-storage facilities. There also is an abundant amount of land south or east of 951 and 41 that this facility that they've proposed will fit. And I'm going to say it again. There's an abundant [sic] of land. This is nothing but an opportunity and on the backs of the residents.

An approval here today would provide no value to the county but certainly admit our public officials have made a huge error in messaging to the residents. There is no additional need for more additional self-storage facilities in this county. Collier County is being smothered by self-storage facilities.

Now, if I can get onto the land that's behind Myrtle Lane, it's 186 acres, roughly. They're all individual residential parcels, about one acre. They're landlocked. They've been landlocked since the '70s. Nothing will happen to those properties. It's an ideal park. It's an ideal residential development. The greatest and best access is on the properties they're trying to steal and landlock as part of the easements and their use.

There's a four-way intersection that was created years ago. The State has already done all the infrastructure and all the improvements to that four-way light. It's ready. They're not using it. They're proposing not to use it.

There's a reason why the State did it. I drive Collier County. I live here full-time. This would probably be one of the only intersections created and established as a four-way that wouldn't be used, and we've already made the investment for it.

If they want to move -- or can they move the U-Haul business from where it is, how they operate, onto either one of those parcels. Let them do it if they're allowed to, but I see no benefit to the residents or to the community to even consider this proposal.

Much of the information they've said here today is not accurate from the library or from the public venue item we had. And also, the 200,000-square-foot use or building versus the extortion type of style versus having a car dealership or an office building, if it qualifies, it qualifies. I just ask that you don't grant any of these approval or proposal requests. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

MR. ALONSO: Our next speaker is going to be Claudia Fuller, followed by Steve Fuller.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Good morning, Ms. Fuller.

MS. FULLER: Hi. Claudia Fuller. I was going to try to put this up, but I don't know if it will go up there. This is the -- I'm not sure if it's the right angle.

This -- ooh, sideways -- is a page from the East Naples Comprehensive Development Plan, and it is of this intersection. The important thing to know from this intersection, we're not just talking about Myrtle Lane. Myrtle Lane, as everybody has said, has a small amount of RMF-6, and the rest of the street is single-family homes, all of a certain size acreage. It's a narrow lane, 17 feet wide, and it has kind of tight access.

But the important thing also is right across the street is Naples Manor. So there is a lot of traffic through this area. And what their changes are requesting doesn't just impact our neighborhood. It does impact the neighborhood across the street that is also the access to Lely High School.

So it's important, in my mind, to think about, do we really need this change? How is this change going to benefit our community?

The East Naples Community Development Plan that was part of a county program and paid for with county funds, and a consultant created a more neighborhood-like development that would enhance our community would offer services, doctors' offices, hair salons, mixed-use, as has been mentioned, that would benefit all of the neighbors, not just Myrtle Lane, but also Naples Manor across the way, and maybe even Treviso and the gated communities that surround this area. I don't feel these changes are consistent with the future neighborhood character.

There was discussion about less traffic, but is this less traffic, and at what quality? At one point in the applicant's statement they said: "These are customers that are often driving 32-foot-long moving trucks, and they typically don't have a lot of experience with driving that size of truck." Not really the kind of situation that enhances a neighborhood.

Not really heavily discussed -- I know you guys talked a little bit about maintenance and repair facilities and adding hitches to vehicles. They also want to have a propane facility there. They are taking a multifamily parcel, part of it is multifamily, turning it into commercial, and they are going to have propane there. Nowhere on the site plan are they showing where those propane tanks are. That is less than 500 feet from single-family homes. It's less than one foot from other zoned RMF-6.

Finally, the applicant said, "Oh, there's a high-market demand." Within three miles there are six to eight other self-storage facilities, and they keep going up. And there is a self-storage facility right next door. Whether it's an old-fashioned self-storage facility or a new-fashioned one, it's still a self-storage facility, and they are just lining the East Trail. This kind of facility is better suited for an activity center like Collier/951 or even better near the interstate.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Ms. Fuller.

MR. ALONSO: Our next speaker is Steve Fuller, followed by Joe Smith.

MR. FULLER: Thank you. My name is Steve Fuller. I'm also a Myrtle Lane resident, and I concur with Mr. Vick [sic] and my previous speaker, my wife, Claudia, on all they said about the single-family parcels that aren't being addressed.

From the get-go, when the applicant stood up and started to talk about Myrtle Lane, I was pretty embarrassed, actually, by the lack of concern that they really had for the residents down this street that's -- as Claudia said, it's only 17 feet long.

A lot of the -- these are one-acre-plus sites. A lot of the residents that have lived here multi generations, they drive boats, they've got trailers. They work. And I've been on that street -- right now, by the way, that street still has Milton debris that comes a foot and a half from each side of the street. So as we pass one another in a truck, in a car, we have to stop, and we have to get off to the right, off to the left, so people can get by. It's not a standard street that you would see in a development now.

Moving on from that, the intersection that they want the redevelopment -- and I love the fact they call it Myrtle Lane. It's really not Myrtle Lane. They wouldn't build a U-Haul on Myrtle Lane. They would build a U-Haul on 41, and that's what you want. And they want that U-Haul site because it was the least expensive going at the time.

And let's put the cards on the table. It's Metropolitan of Naples. It's a development that's built a large parcel at 41 and Davis. And how they got county coding to go to the height

they have, it's already under a lot of dispute and discussion.

So they want to kick the can down the road. They want to move, in my mind, a pretty dysfunctional U-Haul center, which is only on one acre -- and I've been in that place at least a half a dozen times, and I've witnessed it. They want to move that down to a residential neighborhood, and they expect it to have no impact: Air guns, air hammers, activity on vehicles, propane sales, knuckleheads driving their U-Hauls in for the first time.

I love the count of 62 maximum counts per hour. I've had to pause on 41 while there have been three people trying to get their U-Haul into the existing site. It's a mess. And this particular facility will bring nothing but chaos to this intersection.

Don't know why they've centered on it. You've talked about it, and I appreciate a lot of your questions about noise and sound.

Oh, they'll take the heavier work off site. This is going to be their mega-center. They won't have an off-site facility to service their vehicles. It will all be done on site. So that kind of really talks to their site choice.

They've scaled that building height, by the way. Their original proposal was 70 feet. They've scaled it back to 50; 50 feet. There's not a building on the East Trail that's 50 feet right now. And then they've got an additional 10 feet to go to that 60-foot height for ancillary structures, tower, whatever. How about a big, glowing, orange U-Haul sign?

It's not really going to be an asset to the East Trail for visitors, our tourists, but more importantly for residents, taxpaying homeowners, people that rent, people that are looking for that hairdresser or nail salon or whatever a generalized community center base would offer.

A storage facility is something -- if somebody needs -- and they'll drive. They'll drive two miles, they'll drive 10 miles to store their stuff. So I really feel it's the wrong location.

That land is low. There's very little drainage. Myrtle Lane already floods with every storm we get nowadays.

So another comment somebody mentioned is, "Gee, there's a lot of concrete." And was there ever any offering of, "Oh, we're going to have berms and buffers with -- inside this envelope"? No. The comment was, "There will be vehicles parked there."

So, you know, it's hard to understand how this impermeable footprint, which is technically up-slope from all the homes on Myrtle, are ever going to aid to the drainage.

I'm confused as to the fact that this was ever zoned for a car dealership. Somebody else made the comment that there was a lot of new information which seemed very inaccurate in this meeting. I want to -- I want to echo that -- that particular cause because I've heard a lot of new comments that we didn't hear in the neighborhood meeting. And they don't seem to really make sense, and I don't think they're all true.

So I guess the bottom line is, yeah, that community -- and it's not just Myrtle Lane. Let's back it up. This is a valuable -- another good comment. This is a valuable four-way intersection that's now going to be capitalized on, cannibalized on, and really, it won't be a four-way intersection. It's going to be the U-Haul main entrance.

The other side of that intersection is a road that goes through a public neighborhood that goes to Park Elementary, Lely High School, and it's a very busy intersection, and it's a very vibrant community. Nobody wants to really talk about the Manor. It's been that way for years. I've been here for 40 years. But it is a vibrant community that also ranks in importance as well as Myrtle Cove Acres.

So to cannibalize on that intersection for a -- for a business that is really a destination-driven business is unfair to the county residents. It's unfair to the county

developers and council members, and it's going to leave a blemish that is going to be on your watch. And I think time will show that you made a mistake.

So I talked about the 50-foot height, which is absolutely insane. I love the bells and whistles that they pull out with a buffer, you know. They talk about this beautiful buffer. Well, that buffer isn't going to do squat. That buffer's not going to hide the cars that are parked in the parking lot, the 50-foot-tall building, the signage, you know.

So I'm going to echo back to the 2020 East Naples Redevelopment Council's plan. I don't know if you guys have seen that, but you certainly should. You should look at that. You should look at the value that that would bring to the neighboring communities. You should look at that to see the value it would bring to the overall complexion of East Naples, the 41 Trail, the entrance into Naples from that direction.

So I'm not a public speaker, and I'd love to go on, but I don't want to ramble.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: I'm going to have to ask you to wrap it up, because I've got you at seven minutes now.

MR. FULLER: All right. Well, okay. I'll let it go, but I think you know my feelings.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, sir.

MR. ALONSO: Our next speaker's going to be Joe Smith, followed by Kathy Smith.

MR. SMITH: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Good morning, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: How you doing?

I live on Myrtle Lane, 5240. My family has owned property on Myrtle Lane since 1968. I was born in -- I was born Naples Community Hospital in 1963.

Been on Myrtle Lane since I was nine years old playing up and down the street. Graduated high school, went in the Navy, retired from the Navy, moved back home to Myrtle Lane.

I call it -- sorry. I call it my home. I call it -- friends, family, residents, we all use the street. We use the street for walking. We use the street for biking. There's many kids on the street. There's traffic on the street, as other people mentioned. The street is very narrow. You're going to be putting U-Haul trucks -- we know not every single one's going to come down the street, but there's going to be U-Haul trucks coming down the street.

When the garbage trucks come down the street now, as Steve said earlier, you have to pull over. You have to wait until the garbage truck leaves the street to get off the street or to get on the street because the street is so narrow. There's no sidewalks. There's no place for anybody to go.

This is a big safety issue for the residents of our street. Growing up there, there was about 10 houses on the street. Now there's 30, 33, 34, 35.

It's not a place for a commercial/industrial facility as U-Haul. U-Haul right now is in an industrial facility in an industrial area. Why can they not put it in an industrial park in another part of the county?

That's all I've got to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Smith. And I thank you for your service as well, sir.

MR. ALONSO: Our next speaker is going to be Kathy Smith, followed by our final speaker, Michael Bailey.

MS. SMITH: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Good morning.

MS. SMITH: I'm Kathy Smith. We live on Myrtle Lane, as my husband said. His -- him and his family have owned property there for over 50 years. His cousin, Cricket Thornton, they've been there over 50 years as well.

A huge thing for me is a safety issue and the traffic this will create. There's going to be increased traffic. There's going to be large trucks moving on and off this property. And as far as not creating any noise, they're going to be diesel trucks; they're noisy. There's going to be reverse sensors that we're going to hear all day long.

We have kids. They're going to be walking back and forth to school. My youngest son was hit in that intersection by a car walking home from Lely High School by a red light runner. Now you want to add more vehicles, big trucks, inexperienced drivers driving these big trucks around that intersection.

They're going to -- like, my husband said, they're going to be coming down our street. Not every one of them, but they're going to get turned around and come down the street. It's just a huge safety factor for our children, grandchildren, pets, our residents that are walking by -- you know, walking and riding their bikes.

We're a very small, quiet community. We're very close knit. We all know each other. Before the neighborhood meeting, we had our own neighborhood meeting, and we had 34 residents at my house to support [sic] this. We don't want this. We don't want the zoning change. We don't want to accommodate, you know, this type of facility.

This facility needs to be an industrial park, or a 951/Beck Boulevard area, 951/41 area east. And like someone else mentioned, we have CubeSmart right next door. Literally on the other side of the fence from this facility is CubeSmart. Whether it's old or not, it's a facility, storage facility.

These gentlemen can sell you all day long on this facility, why it would benefit, you know, the community. That's their job. That's what they're here for. They're getting paid to do that. But at the end of the day, it's our neighborhood. When this is all said and done, that's our community. That's our neighborhood. We have to live there. We have to put up with the traffic. We have to put up with the safety issues, the noise, the inconvenience. You know, and driving through a parking lot to go to a red light, I mean, it just doesn't make sense.

So, you know, on behalf of the other residents that couldn't make it, we really hope that you deny this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Ms. Smith.

MR. ALONSO: Our next and final speaker is going to be Michael Bailey.

MR. BAILEY: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Good morning, Mr. Bailey.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I was born and raised here in Naples, 1957. Been here 67 and a half years. And I think they've done some over-improvement in Naples. You guys have done a pretty good job, but here's another slice of the pie that's going to take off on us. There's too much traffic there, and it's going to create more. This is just not a simple "just move it over; they don't cause much problem."

The LP gas that they sell is a big line of traffic. And then people driving the U-Haul trailers and trucks, they're unfamiliar with them. They say, "Oh, it drives just like a car," until they get out in traffic.

We don't have any sidewalks on our street. They're very -- it's an extra narrow street. I drive a full-size pickup, and if I pass Joe Smith in his full-size, our mirrors about touch. One of us has to go in the grass. So that's -- it's just not right.

The self-storage is -- they're everywhere in Collier County, and a lot of them are being turned into little stores. You lift up the garage door, and then there's another facade there with an air-conditioner in it with some guy sewing or painting something or doing stickers for cars and all kinds of little items, which is going to increase the traffic more and more.

The -- this -- these guys do a great job with what they're doing. They're really good at it. But this guy over here, it seems like he should be sitting over here. He's a lobbyist. Everything he said to you, he was shaking his head "yes," and if you don't like that, we'll change it. We'll do this. We'll do this. Who's he working for. I'd like to know.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: He works for the county, Mr. Bailey.

MR. BAILEY: Well, he seemed like he's a lobbyist for these gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Well --

MR. BAILEY: If you -- go back and watch what he said earlier; just watch it.

Anyhow, I agree with what else was said here, and I don't think there's any room for it. And I appreciate your time. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Is there anyone else that would like to be heard that did not fill out a form?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: No?

Okay. At this time we'll turn it back over to you, Rich, for rebuttal and questions.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I dropped my papers. Can you give me just one second?

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Yeah --

MR. YOVANOVICH: Thanks. I can assure you Mr. Bosi doesn't work for my side of the table. I've dealt with him for all of the years and --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: I know he doesn't, Mr. Yovanovich. I think what -- I think what we need to do is put up Mike's stat sheet on how many things never get here because he stops them.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Right. And I think the general public doesn't understand how many people come to me or to Mr. Arnold and say, "We want to do A, B, and C," and we say, "No, that's never going to fly. I don't want my hands on it."

I could tell you I've never been here at a podium on a project that I'm embarrassed to be here on or think it would be detrimental to any community that's surrounded by that project. And nobody on this team -- we've all been here a long time and have worked hard to improve Collier County with the different projects we represent.

I want to talk about facts, because I know every project that we bring forward now is by a residential neighborhood, and there's always fear and concern about what is this project going to do to the neighborhood.

Let's start with the fact -- can we go back to the visualizer?

Let's start with the fact that this property is already zoned for commercial uses on the property. I'm not asking you to take a residential piece of property and create commercial uses on the property. There's already commercial uses on the property.

People are concerned about traffic. Fact: We're asking you to reduce the amount of traffic we can generate from this site. Your staff has reviewed that and has verified we're going from 238 peak-hour trips to 62 peak-hour trips. I'm not a math whiz, but that's probably

25 percent of the traffic that could currently go on that site. We're asking you to reduce that traffic.

We are not taking anybody's access away from Myrtle Lane. Mr. Jones can still go home on Myrtle Lane. He does not have to drive through the U-Haul site to get home. That's not what we're asking to do. Myrtle Lane will stay Myrtle Lane all the way to U.S. 41.

What we're doing is we're giving the people who live on Myrtle Lane the opportunity to get to a traffic signal to take a left-hand turn to go towards town should they choose to do so. That's what we're doing. We're not closing Myrtle Lane, and we're not saying -- one of the speakers said, we'll, we're not even going to activate -- we're not going to use the light. We are going to use the light. That is part of what this project is is we will be using the traffic signal which would mean we can go right towards Miami and we go left towards downtown out from -- at a safe controlled access.

We are on 41. I'm not going to say nobody will ever make the mistake of turning left on Myrtle to get to 41 to get out with a truck, but I don't think people who come to rent a truck at U-Haul are going to go on Myrtle down towards a residential neighbor when they have a safe move at a traffic signal to leave the site and to come back to the site. So traffic is not a safety concern.

Every one of our vehicles are gas. Our vehicles you can rent with a regular driver's license. Maximum size is 26 feet, not 32 feet, by a prior speaker; 26 feet.

I've driven them. I probably -- most of you have -- I don't know, maybe you haven't. But I've driven one of those. I'm okay driving it. I don't want to do it for a living, but yes, I have used a U-Haul truck to move stuff and put them in a storage facility and brought back the truck. It would have been nice if I could have just gone to the storage facility where I rented the truck and not have to drive the truck and drop it off somewhere else.

Factually, there is a demand for indoor self-storage in Collier County. They don't build these facilities and hope they're going to get occupied. Go around. Try to find one that has significant vacancies in them. They rent up really quickly because, basically, people don't have storage.

I have one. I have -- you know, it basically is my -- most people use their garage. I don't have a garage. I have a storage facility. I go to it probably once a month to get the Christmas ornaments, to get the Thanksgiving decorations, Halloween, things like that. We use it. But they're not high-traffic generators, and they are compatible with residential.

On Pine Ridge Road, at U.S. 41 and Pine Ridge Road, there's a LockUp storage. Wayne and I worked on that before there was this proliferation of indoor self-storage. Our neighbor, the immediate -- immediate south -- closer than what we're asking for right now, residential. We're a quiet use, and it actually buffers sounds because the building itself acts as a buffer to traffic on U.S. 41.

So it's compatible with residential neighborhoods. It should be located near residential because residential are the primary users.

We can't have businesses operating out of this. We haven't asked for that use. We have 3,000 square feet of retail. It's going to be in the big building, and it's going to serve U-Haul.

So if there's -- if somebody's operating a business that's in another one of these, that's probably a code enforcement violation, and that needs to be looked into. But we're not allowed to have that operated on our site. So that's a factually incorrect statement by one of the speakers.

Drainage. Well, we're at a zoning hearing, but I could put my civil engineer up here and talk about how the site will be bermed to make sure that water is contained on site, that it's not a free-flow of water going all over into the neighborhood and that it will be held back and it will be allowed to discharge at the adopted discharge rate. That's the fact about drainage.

If there's pervious area or impervious area -- impervious area, we have to account for that water, keep it on our site, and discharge it at the adopted rate. It's not going to be a free flow of water, and we're not going to flood out our neighbors. That is -- probably nine out of 10 hearings I attend they say you're going to flood us. In fact, we're probably going to make it a little bit better. In most situations, there is a free flow of water right now because it rains. The water goes wherever the water goes. Now when it rains, we're going to keep it on site, and we're going to discharge it at the county's adopted discharge rate.

I know people don't like change. We -- this is a commercial site, end of story. That was a pretty picture that was put up there by some consultant who decided that this is what they would like to see happen on the East Trail. Taking into consideration that that was a beautiful picture that will probably never happen, did you see the road that was going to extend parallel to U.S. 41 that doesn't exist? There's -- you know, those are beautiful, beautiful pictures, but they're not real-world pictures. This site's not going to develop like it was pictured in that picture.

This is -- by Mr. Bosi and your staff -- it takes us almost a year to get here from when we submit, and it takes that long because we go back and forth about what changes would staff like to see; what could be better?

We had asked for deviation said to the architectural standards. Staff said, "Absolutely not. No deviations to the architectural standards." We gave up on those deviations to the architectural stands. We had asked for deviations to the sign code. Staff said, "Absolutely not." We gave up on the deviations to the sign code. We didn't get a rubber stamp to get here. We went long and hard.

We didn't want the interconnection. "Please take it away from us." We would not -- we would prefer not to have people drive through the site, but it's a benefit to the neighborhood. It's not a lot of traffic that's going to come through this site to get to the traffic signal to head back west into town.

This is a good project. It is a safe project, and if their true concerns are safety related to traffic -- which I think everybody seems to say traffic, traffic, traffic -- this is better. Undisputed, factually correct, this is a better scenario for traffic than what can happen on the site today.

And the person who kept saying there were a lot of misrepresentations made in our presentation, I don't know of any misrepresentation made in this presentation. And when he talked about whether or not motor vehicle dealerships are allowed -- I heard him say he doesn't believe that that's true -- Use No. 25 in the current PUD is motor vehicle dealers, new only. So I can't put a Stearns Motors there, but I can put a new dealership there.

And what comes with new dealerships? Maintenance of those vehicles and other things like that. We're not asking for maintenance of the vehicles on this site. So if he's got anything else that he wants to tell me that our team didn't say that was true, I'm happy to address them. Everything we say when we're here, we're under oath. We tell you the truth. And the truth is this is a better project traffic-wise and is more safe than what can be there under the current zoning.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Rich -- Mr. Yovanovich, could you slide that down a little bit? I just want to see that top line. Eating places except for caterers and industrial, industrial food services. Would that site allow a drive-in restaurant and outdoor televisions and speakers and amplifiers? Is that the way that reads?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, it says I can't have outdoor entertainment or outdoor televisions, no. But I can have -- I can have restaurants, I can have -- restaurants that are fast food drive-throughs absolutely can go on that site.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Okay. You sure they want to do a videotape rental?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, you know, I don't think my kids even know what a videotape rental is.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: What is it?

MR. YOVANOVICH: But, you know -- but those used to be popular if you owned any -- if you had stock in Blockbuster, you know. You better rewind, or they fined you.

But with that, that's our presentation. This is a good project. This is a safe project. We're going to meet all the architectural standards. And this property is a commercial site that we're asking to make modifications to the commercial site.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Chuck, this is Joe. I have a couple of comments.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Rich.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: You mentioned the drainage. Just for clarification, I want to make sure that the public understands that the drainage will still have to go through the ERP process, that's the Environmental Resource Permit process, through the South Florida Water Management District, is that correct, for this site? Can your engineer testify to that?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Yeah. I'll have Mr. Delate come up here and tell you -- put on the record that we've got to go through the Water Management District permitting process, and what the discharge would be.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yeah. Mike, can do that. And I just would like for him -- because there was a comment made about drainage, and I would like to have him put something on the record. Thanks.

But before you do that, the other is there was a comment about servicing a vehicle. You made that clear, but I would like for you to stress that again. And the third point I would ask that you would clarify, what is the extent of the propane services? Is this a -- just a distribution center for tanks, or will there be filling and refilling of tanks? I would like to get some clarification on that. Thanks.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Yeah. You will be able to -- there will be propane that the general public can come and access as part of this -- as part of this. So, yeah, the -- there will be -- you can refill your tank there, you know. I guess at some point, if your vehicle uses propane, you can use propane there. And we also are providing charging stations for electrical vehicles for the general public.

So there's a lot of general public benefit. It's safe. It will go through the Site Development Plan review process to address all at regulations associated with the propane sales.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So you'll be dealing with bulk propane rather than just exchanging one tank for another?

MR. YOVANOVICH: You could fill your tank there, yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: You can actually fill it, okay.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Will the reserve tank be above ground?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Below ground?

MR. YOVANOVICH: It's above. It's an above-ground tank.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. So we don't see that on the proposed master plan?

MR. YOVANOVICH: This is not a Site Development Plan level criteria. That will all be addressed at the Site Development Plan, just like the electrical vehicle charging stations and things like that will all be part of the Site Development Plan review process.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Before you get into that drainage, Commissioner Petscher, you had a question, sir?

COMMISSIONER PESTCHER: Yeah, I have a couple of questions.

You did mention that it will -- all these vehicles will go off site to be maintained. Where will they be -- where's the closest maintenance facility for these vehicles?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Do you know where it is?

I don't know where the closest -- I'm assuming they're going to have to have an industrial area that they can do the motor vehicle.

COMMISSIONER PESTCHER: My second question is I went through the neighborhood information meeting, and I read all the opposition e-mails. Was there any oppositions from Treetops or anybody at the Manor?

MR. YOVANOVICH: I don't recall seeing any -- definitely not the Manor, and I don't recall anybody from Treetops coming in speaking on this.

COMMISSIONER PESTCHER: My final question is Myrtle Drive -- or Myrtle Lane there, you did mention that you do believe maybe some people might go -- make the wrong turn.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I said I'm not going to say it will never happen, because the minute I say that, someone's going to make that turn.

COMMISSIONER PESTCHER: Absolutely.

MR. YOVANOVICH: But why would you ever go left unless you're renting a vehicle?

COMMISSIONER PESTCHER: Now, is there any plans to make -- two-part question. Is there any plans to make improvements to that road? And my second part of that question is would be developer be in favor or opposed to actually making -- widening the first -- first 100 feet, or whatever it is, to your driveway there? Because as we've heard from a number of the residents, it is a very narrow road.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well -- and, Commissioner Petscher, when we do our site review, staff will talk to us about whether it -- based upon what traffic impacts we may have to Myrtle, what upgrades we may have to make to our entrance. I don't know that -- probably a sidewalk, for sure, but I don't know that there will be anything beyond that necessary related to our use of Myrtle related to our project.

COMMISSIONER PESTCHER: Is there going to be a turn lane on 41 there turning into that place?

MR. TREBILCOCK: That's something we would evaluate and determine and work with the department whether they would want to put that in or not and require it, depending on

the traffic volume and speeds and such. And similar, as Rich mentioned, on the access road on Myrtle, the county will look to maintain at least the minimum standards up to the access point as well.

COMMISSIONER PESTCHER: No further questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Okay. Before I get to Commissioner McLeod, I do want to hear about the drainage that Chair Schmitt was asking about, please.

MR. DELATE: Good morning. For the record, Mike Delate with Grady Minor. I'm an engineer there.

As Mr. Schmitt alluded to, this project is at the Water Management District right now for a review of the ERP application. So we will have to meet all the criteria of the Water Management District.

And then the discharge from the site, you can see the designated water management area here. There's a county-maintained ditch and drainage easement that runs east/west along the southern property here and will discharge into that. And the county, under the Site Development Plan review, will review that discharge rate and location. Yeah, somewhere there.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Mike, thanks. Thanks for putting that on the record.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

Commissioner McLeod.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Mr. Yovanovich, thank you for addressing some of the concerns that were brought up by the residents. Just a couple that were not addressed yet, one being the -- and maybe this is for Mike, Mr. Bosi.

The community towards the south of this development, there was a comment that was made that it would -- this project would -- I can't think of another word, but "trap" the land on the other side. There would be no access to that available land with this project. Is that true?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, I don't know what access -- honestly, I've not done the legal research on what their access point is today. So to answer the question, this project's not causing anything from a land-locking. The facts are what the facts are. This project's been here and approved in a different -- that's in a PUD right now. Where these parcels are getting their access, I don't know. Maybe they're accessing 6th.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: It's just an interesting question.

MR. YOVANOVICH: It is.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: How does one plan for something like this in the future when you have a parcel in the middle of other areas? How does access get planned?

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director.

And I may have to lean upon our Transportation staff for that, but in terms of -- the consideration for where access was to be provided for the agricultural parcels was never, I believe, contemplated by this -- by the current -- the current PUD.

Transportation would have to look at the various avenues. I would say it would be either 7th, 6th, 5th or 4th is where access would have to be provided, down one of those local streets to be able to access those parcels if they were ever, you know, requesting development, which at some point in time they will.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And I'm sure the owner of that parcel knows about this project, and if there were concerns, he would have addressed them.

MR. BOSI: There are a number of individual parcels. They're very -- they're smaller than the five-acre requirement for -- that ag has. I think they're probably about -- maybe less

than an acre or acre lots, so they're all individual owners.

So I think what the problem is is with individual owners, the assembly of land is going to be -- would be difficult. But at some point in time, this land will be developed, and they'll have to find access to that location.

But it's never been contemplated, or there's never been a reservation from a transportation perspective related to any of the property that's within the current commercial PUD or anything proposed for the amendment to the PUD.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. And then, Mr. Yovanovich, you had said that this is commercially zoned. You wouldn't -- you're not asking for anything outside of that, but there is one parcel that's the RM-6.

MR. YOVANOVICH: RMF-6, that is correct, that 1.2 acres we are adding to this. But at the end of the day, I already have in place over seven acres that can have 61,000 square feet of retail and significantly more traffic. We are -- you're correct that we are adding the 1.2 acres of residential multifamily to the overall project.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify that for the record.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I understand. I understand.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And I think my only last question is there was a concern about safety and a child crossing the street to go to high school.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Look, I don't want to sound insensitive. We already could put 238 p.m. peak-hour trips on this site. I'm asking you to let me reduce that to 62 p.m. peak-hour trips. There's a traffic signal there. It's tragic when someone goes through a red light. It is tragic. That's going to happen, and it happens. We are improving the safety by reducing the number of trips coming and going from this site.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: That could potentially be on that site.

MR. YOVANOVICH: That would be on that site if it's something else. We are reducing the number of potential trips coming and going to this site into that intersection and potentially increasing the number of accidents that could occur by people crossing the street to go to the high school or to businesses along there or homes that they're visiting. I think we're -- we're improving traffic safety. I think that's factually correct.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Secretary Shea.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Question for Mike. I guess I don't want to give up on this. What would it take to not have an access on Myrtle? I just -- I know it's required. To me that seems like it's going to really make the whole situation worse. If you -- I'd rather see you eliminate the Myrtle access to the property.

MR. BOSI: From Transportation's perspective, we think there's a benefit of allowing the folks on Myrtle Lane to access the transportation -- to access the existing traffic light to be able to have a safer egress to the north and to the west.

There was -- there was an opportunity --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: They didn't seem to really like it.

MR. BOSI: I'm not sure -- I haven't heard any of the folks say that they did not want access to that light. I haven't heard that. They haven't they've said they don't want this project. I don't think that --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: I don't want to drive through a project on a road that doesn't even belong to us. We have to drive through it.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: We're not speaking, please.

MR. YOVANOVICH: You don't have to come through our property. Go straight on Myrtle Road and take a right turn. We're not asking you to come through our property. We're giving you the opportunity if you want.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So what's wrong with just eliminating that? And I know you're doing it because we're asking you to do it, so I'm not --

MR. BOSI: The access --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: It's a benefit only. I mean, it doesn't --

MR. BOSI: It's safety --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: If you don't do it, they have the same situation they've had for years.

MR. BOSI: It's a safety benefit. It's an additional measure --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Oh, wow.

MR. BOSI: -- of public safety benefit.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: I think it's -- I think it's more unsafe going through the site.

MR. YOVANOVICH: They don't have to, Commissioner Shea. Those who want to go through the site -- and believe me, there were people at the NIM that said we want to get to that light because we want to go -- I guess that's north, but my instincts tells me it's west because the beach is always to the west -- going north so they can go without having to come out and take a right and find a place to make that U-turn with their boat trailer.

MR. BOSI: And I would -- that's simply staff's perspective. Staff is going to advocate for allowing that. If the Planning Commission has felt well within your right to make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners that that easement be extinguished and not provide that access to the traffic light, if that's the perspective of the Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Could we have a discussion on that? That is a pretty valid point. I didn't recognize that it was something we could suggest or possibly push back on.

Mike, I'm understanding it was a recommendation, a request, not a demand from --

MR. BOSI: The current PUD has that access allowance and requirement. Transportation saw value within that access allowance for individuals making a northwest movement accessing the light. Transportation -- or that's Transportation's perspective. That's staff's perspective. We are recommending that that maintain -- that stays within the amended PUD.

The Planning Commission most certainly can have a different perspective if they feel that it creates more of an issue than a benefit.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. I open up for a chance for conversation between the Board here. I apologize, I did not recognize we could supersede that, shall I say. Okay.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Can I add to the conversation? What we originally had that identified as is an emergency access for fire, police, or whatever to get to the site. We would like it -- that's what we had it as is emergency only. I think that's important for there to at least be emergency access to this site for fire and others to get there.

If you want to close it off to everything else but only emergency for us, we're fine with that, but that wasn't what the original PUD said, and that's not what Transportation said, and that's not what several of the people at the neighborhood information meeting said regarding wanting to have access to that light.

Again, we'd rather not have it, but I think it's fair that we let you know that there were others who thought that having access to that light was a public benefit.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: And I understand that. I wanted to make sure that we weren't going different amongst the requirements or regulations, and if there's no need for discussion and we don't wish to do anything and let it stand as-is, fine. I just put two and two together here now and recognized we could make a recommendation if we thought it was in the best public interest not to have that.

And to piggyback that comment, first of all, I'd like to thank the public for coming up and expressing your thoughts, concerns, and wishes. But I do want to make sure the public recognizes we are an advisory-only position board. Everything you said, if you wish, will be more potent if you go to the Board of County Commissioners and redo your stances and make your statements. We are advisory. There have been many times when the Board -- BCC will go different than what we recommend. So I just wanted to make sure you recognize that. We're advisory only.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: If you want to -- it would be good to hear from Norm and Mike just to get their professional opinion on whether -- is it really safer to go through --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: A parking lot.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: -- a parking lot versus just continue doing what you're already doing. They're the professionals. I'm not. I'm just raising the question. It doesn't seem like it would be to me. So I don't know if that's worth Norm commenting on it and maybe Mike.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Colucci.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, I think you should --

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Well, I think this is -- to me this is common sense. The thought of people, residents going through a business's lot to get to the street to me is crazy.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: My view is leave it the way it is now. If you're going to build this thing, leave it the way it is now as it relates to how these residents get to 41, but don't tempt the residents to drive through a parking lot. Just, common sense, makes no sense.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Before Mike gets up here, the history of that provision was the residents on Myrtle Lane wanted the access to the light. That's the history of when it was put in there in 2006. If they want to change their mind, that's fine. I'll let the professionals talk about whether it's a good idea to not give them an opportunity to get to a light or not.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Well, they can't get to the light now, right?

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: I don't understand. To me it's a common-sense issue.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Public comment is closed at this time, please.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: To me it's just simply common sense. My common sense is I don't want to give these residents the temptation of driving through someone else's parking lot to get access to 41 when they already have it. And I have nothing else to say.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, sir.

Mike.

MR. SAWYER: Good morning, Commissioners. Mike Sawyer, Transportation Planning.

Part of it is that it is already something that's part of the PUD. And we look at this

somewhat similarly than -- as we do with an interconnection where we're trying to contact, you know, road lengths, and especially in this case we're trying to get traffic more easily onto 41 and allowing them to go east and west, north/south, whichever way you want to look at it. It also eliminates, primarily, the need for people that are wanting to go northwest from doing a U-turn movement. And a lot of people don't like doing those, quite honestly. And if you are able to get to a signal, we view that as a good thing for traffic.

Now, as far as how the traffic is actually going to go through the parcel, that's going to be done when we get to the point of having a Site Development Plan, which lays everything out. And at that point, staff is going to want to make sure that it does have a clear path from Myrtle Lane over to the signal. How that's going to happen, we don't know yet because we haven't seen the site plan.

I don't know if that helps you with, you know, your conversation, with your discussion. I'm just saying that's how we looked at it, something that's already in the PUD, and we looked at it as a good thing to retain.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Mike --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Sparrazza.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Sorry.

Mike, it also looks as if people heading -- I'll do a Mr. Yovanovich -- towards the beach, okay, on 41, they'll be able to turn left and go into this establishment to get to Myrtle Lane, because right now they can't. They'd have to go past Myrtle Lane, do a U-turn, come down and turn right into Myrtle Lane, correct?

MR. SAWYER: Agreed. And, again, that's another U-turn movement that would not be required.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Correct. We're looking at two-way traffic not just -- we're looking at two-way traffic to and from Myrtle Lane, not just Myrtle Lane residents exiting through this parking lot to go to the beach.

MR. SAWYER: We always look at both directions, sir.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. So there could be more movement through this parking lot by people going to -- going to work and also returning from work to home. So there could be two cars -- probably very, very minor chance, but there could be two cars of Myrtle residents in this parking lot going to and from the home, to and from the light, correct?

MR. SAWYER: Correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: All right.

MR. SAWYER: And keep in mind, even if we're looking at a situation where the site plan looks like it has basically parking areas. Well, you need to have parking islands/landscape islands in all of those areas at a starting point. That's just for normal traffic in a normal parking lot. In this case what we've got a requirement for staff to look at is also making sure that there's a clear path, again, from Myrtle over to the signal.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: That's the hard part we have is we struggle -- I do -- visualizing how you're going to do that. And we see an empty parking lot that looks like chaos. We're not professional traffic -- transportation people, so we can't visualize how you're going to make that safe, so that's part of our concern.

MR. SAWYER: I understand.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Obviously, you have some ideas, but it's not time yet.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: And that would come up during the Site Development Plan.

MR. SAWYER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Mike, can you think of any offhand that have -- another piece of property that has this type of easement that has been built out? Can you think of anything offhand?

MR. SAWYER: The only thing that I can draw to would a normal shopping center where you've got a -- if you will, a main strip where it has multiple -- you know, multiple businesses, you know, on a large area, and then you also have out-parcels. Well, the way that you have those sites organized is that you have specific out-parcels, and generally you have a road that kind of leads you around and then have individual areas going out to the out-parcels and back to the main center itself.

So a bit of it is really -- it really comes down to correctly site planning the project itself to make sure that you're accommodating, and this is going to be one of the requirements.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Colucci.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: You're all going to get used to me eventually. I think we're spending too much time in the weeds here. The issue here --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Welcome to the Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: I mean, the issue here is are we going to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that this project be approved or not approved. And I feel the issue of whether we allow people to drive through the parking lot or not is not something that we should be overly debating, you know, at this point. There'll come a time, I guess, where that has to be decided, but does it have to be decided now? What has to be decided now is are we going to approve this project or aren't we.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: So let's get on with it.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Well, what we're looking at is if we were going to approve it with a condition. That's what we were kind of discussing, whether we add a condition to it.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Well, I guess I've learned something else, I mean...

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Yeah. All right. Anybody else have a question? Yeah, go ahead, Commissioner McLeod. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I do know of a development that accesses a commercial area to gain access to a main road. That is the Target and Forest Lake behind it. And, Mike, maybe you know -- you know how there's Woodshire Lane?

MR. SAWYER: I believe so I do, yes.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And so that community can access the Target plaza to get out onto Pine Ridge.

MR. SAWYER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Is there any accidents or anything like that that we need to be concerned about in that parking area?

MR. SAWYER: I don't think that we've had any major, you know, accident reports as long as that, you know, center's been there, and I know it's been there well over 20 years. It was there when I, you know --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: In the '90s, yeah, the early '90s.

MR. SAWYER: Yeah, exactly. It seems to work quite well, quite honestly. I go to that center myself quite often.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: That's just an example of one that is in existence.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you. I was racking my brain trying to think

of one.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah. I'm like, "Wait, I know of one."

MR. SAWYER: It's one of those interconnection opportunities that we like to see happen with developments, and all too often we're not able to gain them. It works well for the community. It usually works quite well for the commercial center itself. This is a little different only because it's a single use, primarily.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Sparrazza.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I'd like to make a statement that at this point if we move forward with a vote one way or the other, that we just ask the staff and the developer to look at any and all possibilities to maintain this egress at the light or, if it is not needed, to remove it; more or less removing any conditions that we may put because we don't know exactly what that Site Development Plan's going to look like. We don't know what it's going to shape up to look like, especially with a large LP tank, access easement, whatever that case may be. I think the best thing for this commission to do is to move forward with a vote but do not put any restrictions, plus or minus, against the Myrtle Lane access point.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: When it comes to that turn lane, I don't think U-Haul trucks needs to be on Myrtle Lane, period. If this thing's going to go forward, there's got to be a way to keep -- and I know Rich said, "You can't stop everybody from going there," whatever. I think it needs to be -- it needs to be on record, and it needs to be in the -- in this agreement that, you know, trucks aren't allowed onto that road. You don't want people trying to test drive a U-Haul truck down a residential street. I know what they're talking about with the closeness of the vehicles. Any street you drive down in Golden Gate Estates is the exact same thing; one car's got to get off the road and get on the grass. The other one can stay in the lane. That's what it is.

But I think there's got to be something in there that puts that liability on the operator that if a U-Haul truck goes down that road and there's an accident, it's on them because they were told not to be test driving on Myrtle Lane, period.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I think you should add a condition similar to what we did at Covenant Presbyterian Church -- or Covenant Church now. I think they dropped the Presbyterian.

The Pine Ridge community was concerned about people leaving church and driving through the neighborhood. So the two roads that are on the north side and the south side of that church both prohibit -- well, one prohibits a right, and one prohibits a left. So they sign it to say that you can't do that.

So I think we should put the same signage at that entrance that says, you know, "right turn only," "no left turns," so -- which will be interesting, because the person who -- I guess anybody who wants to rent a truck on Myrtle Lane will go out on 41 and do a U-turn to come back home.

(Simultaneous crosstalk.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Exactly.

MR. YOVANOVICH: You know, you laugh. But I lived in -- I lived in Pine Ridge, and if I ever went to that church, I never drove back through my neighborhood. I honored the sign. You know, I went -- I just went and did the circuitous route, and they'll have to do the same.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Yeah. I had a couple other things on here. The signage, let me get back to that signage. That has been a concern that has come up. What

type of signage does U-Haul use?

MR. YOVANOVICH: We're going to meet the code.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: What is the code on that signage?

MR. YOVANOVICH: The code allows, I think, one sign on the building.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: One sign on the building and -- monument?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Yeah. We're going to have -- we're allowed monument signs. We're allowed a building sign. We're going to meet the code.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Not a 30-foot billboard --

MR. YOVANOVICH: No.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: -- with big fluorescent lights?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Whatever the code -- the code maximum is what we'll go with.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Chuck, this is Joe.

Yeah, the sign standards for the county are, quite honestly, quite strict. I'm very familiar with it. And they will have to meet the code requirements, and that will all be reviewed during the SDP process. And this petition has no variance at all or nor have we even discussed any variance. So based on what they're asking for, they have to meet the code requirements, as Rich just stated.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

The drainage was obviously also an issue. Mike, I'm going to kick this over to you. You have to refresh my memory, but I believe if you're drainage leaves your property and damages another, that's -- that's on the offending property, correct?

MR. BOSI: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Well, no, no. There's a limit to the size of the storm. I mean, there's --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Well, yeah. I understand that, but --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: There's criteria. So the argument is, what is the storm? Is it a five-day storm? A five-year? A 50-year? But there is a limit. They have -- they can't collect every drop of water that could possibly end up on their property.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Right. Yeah. When the hurricane comes, I'm sure there's some water leaving.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yeah. Southwest has determined certain standards that they have to retain.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: The concern about the self-storage turning into a business, I understand Mr. Bailey's concern, because if you drive down Airport-Pulling, right across the street from the RaceTrac, there's a storage. It looked like it was a storage facility at one point in time and then converted into, like -- almost like a small shop type of deal where each bay has got a different vendor in it. And as long as the code does not allow for that to happen, and if it does, there's consequences that go through with that as well.

MR. BOSI: And, Chair, I can assure you that our code does not allow for those roll-up doors to be designed, so there will be no -- there will be no opportunity for individual units like that. Everything will have to be accessed and interior to the storage facility. There's no -- there's no allowance for roll-up doors with -- anywhere where you can see the right-of-way.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Well, those are typical business condos type of thing -- requirements. This -- this would have -- we could make a stipulation very clear in our

recommendation that there will be no allowance for separate businesses on site. This is strictly a low-impact storage facility, and that's exactly what they're asking for. Plus, of course, the issue with rentals.

MR. YOVANOVICH: But don't --

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Go ahead.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Please understand that indoor self-storage is allowed to have roll-up units. I just want to make sure nobody's under the impression that we're not going to have any roll-up units. We are, but you can't have any businesses operating out -- within those roll-up doors.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: And they don't front the parking lot to where they're accessible to the public if they were to walk up to it.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Right. There --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: You have to go inside.

MR. YOVANOVICH: There's locational requirements that we haven't asked for a deviation from.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: I thought Mrs. Fuller brought up a good point on that East Naples design that was presented. I thought that was -- as you said, that was a rendering that what was done on what they thought would look good there, but if I was a resident, that's what I would think that they were being sold at that point in time.

But, Mike, I believe -- wasn't there -- there was a statute that went into place that put any hold on that type of -- because we were talking about that East Naples -- there was a moratorium that was placed by the State.

MR. BOSI: The East Naples Development Plan, like I said, it was accepted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2020. In -- or in 2023, we adopted the overlay to implement it within the GMP, and that was to increase the density and the heights allowed within the community and the regional centers, but the design standards and the spatial requirements that were suggested by the East Naples Development Plan could not be adopted within a zoning overlay until October 1st of 2026 because of -- the Florida Legislature passed Senate Bill 250, and 250 says that communities that were struck by Hurricane Ian and, I think, Hurricane Frances [sic], within 100 miles of both of those storms were not allowed to adopt any more restrictive regulations to their Land Development Code until October 1st of 2026.

So those -- that overlay to implement the East Naples Development Plan cannot be adopted until October 1st of 2026 per the code -- or per the statute.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

Question for the County Attorney. I'm sorry you haven't gotten any questions today. I feel like I've got to start sending some over.

So if someone were to vote no on this and say it's nonconforming but then somebody comes in and puts a car dealership in, how do those two compare? Or is it just because of the wording that's in the usage for that parcel?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Well, I believe, according to staff, the car dealership is a permitted --

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Correct.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: -- use under the current Myrtle PUD that exists. The warehousing is sometimes both in the C-5 and also the industrial zoning districts. So I don't know if I'm really answering your question.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: No, that makes sense. I was just trying to --

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: -- put the two together, because when you try to find a way to not approve it, you have to have, obviously, a basis for it legally. You just can't say, "I don't like this." There has to be something, whether it was, what, safety or --

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Well, the GMP is a lesser standard, so you just have to state some sort of reasonable basis.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Okay.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: The PUD, you've got -- you have to rely on some of the testimony and the experts to establish competent evidence, competent substantial evidence. But the PUD can't be approved if the GMP is not approved.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you. Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I have.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Go ahead, Commissioner McLeod.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: That drew me to wonder about something. So the GMP amendment would allow for increased intensity to this -- these parcels. Now, when I look at what's currently there, the height of those buildings are 50 feet, allowable 50 feet, and that's what they're doing? Like, what -- what are they increasing in intensity?

MR. BOSI: The square footage and the actual -- one of the -- the use of self -- indoor self-storage is a C-5 permitted use. So they are increasing one use -- the intensity of one use that's associated with the C-5 zoning district where the current existing PUD allows for C-1 to C-3 uses.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And the current PUD, how -- what's the square footage allowable?

MR. BOSI: Sixty-two thousand.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Sixty-one, 61,000.

And I just want to clarify. Actually, self-storage is a conditional use in C-4 zoning. And the unfortunate thing is the way our code is set up, it's -- it uses the SIC code book, and the SIC code book really sends you to -- I guess it doesn't work. It does.

You see, the SIC code book really refers to the old-fashioned mini warehouses, that you are an industrial in character. It doesn't refer to the self-storage that is really being built in Collier County, which is the indoor self-storage, air -- indoor air-conditioned self-storage.

So from an intensity-of-use standpoint, I'm sure I can put many planners up here to say that the 200,000 square feet of indoor self-storage is actually a reduction in intensity from what can be currently allowed on that site. If you simply look at traffic, you probably look at any of the other services provided to the site as far as fire and police, it's going to be a far less intense use than can currently be placed on that site.

But Mike's right, I mean, we're dealing with an SIC code book that refers to the old-fashioned, you know, stuff that, you know, when I was a kid everybody was building that was those metal -- metal one-story, "you better pray it doesn't rain" type of facility versus what's really being built. I don't think you could compare indoor air-conditioned self-storage to the type of SIC code manual, self-storage.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: But this is square footage, though.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Again, intensity of square footage, you can look at -- if you want to look purely at the number of square feet, yeah, it's bigger, but is that more intense? Is that 200,000 square feet increasing the intensity of what's going on on that site? Bigger building, but every other service to that site is reduced.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Mike, can I get your opinion on that?

MR. BOSI: There most certainly -- I mean, it's specifically the intensity of use. So there's more square footage that's allowed, but the square footage -- the use that's associated with that square footage is self-storage. The traffic generation for self-storage is considerably lower than the traffic generation -- or traffic attraction that commercial uses provide.

Commercial uses -- commercial users attract trips, and retail attracts trips at a much higher rate than a self-storage facility. And, I mean, that's -- that's just based upon the ITE and many traffic studies. The intensity of a self-storage facility is relatively low in terms of trip generation.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So the definition of "intensity" is not just the square footage. It's, like, the overall --

MR. YOVANOVICH: Right.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: -- intensity of the project.

MR. BOSI: I could give you an example: An office complex. An office complex of 20,000 square feet would generate a -- would generate a traffic count of, say, 200, but if that was medical office, medical office attracts a much higher trip generation because of the turns. Medical office has a lot of customers coming in. Your normal office environment is a set work staff, maybe some visitors, some businesses, some customers, but nowhere near as many trip -- nowhere near as many attractions in trips that are generated comparatively to a medical office.

So it does matter, not just the square footage that's required, but the type of square footage and what type of intensity is associated with that from a traffic generation, from a water consumption, from a waste disposal, from a noise, from a pollution, from all the other factors that we look at in terms of intensity.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: At this time I would like to move forward with a proposal to -- a proposal for our PL20230016211 and its companion PL20230016212 for approval with the following caveats -- and, fellow commissioners, I may not get them all, so please add to this -- first one -- and, Rich, help me with this, please -- is signage at the Myrtle Lane exit, should that exit exist, which says "right-hand turn only," I believe.

MR. YOVANOVICH: That's fine.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Second is the cost for the traffic signal modification, should there need to be any, would fall 100 percent on the petitioner, correct?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: And third, as minor as it seems, have no public address PA system installed that would announce outdoors for calling in workers that they may have a phone call or something within the office building.

MR. YOVANOVICH: And I would add that we will have a Type B buffer along Myrtle Lane, and we would leave our Type D buffer that we described for the type -- for the buffer along U.S. 41.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Great. Thank you.

Fellow Commissioners, anything else that I have not --

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Randy? Randy?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yes, Joe.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I mean, I would add also -- I would add also -- and I'm going to leave it up to the County Attorney to craft language, but I want to limit any type of

maintenance on site. I know there's what I would call typical preventative maintenance and services, but any intense maintenance, we will restrict any of that activity on the site. So I'll let -- I'll ask the County Attorney if they would craft some language in that in the final ordinance.

MR. YOVANOVICH: So, Mr. Sparrazza --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yes, sir.

MR. YOVANOVICH: -- the reason I have Norm Trebilcock on my team is he made a very good point. If someone's coming home and they live on Myrtle and they take the traffic signal left in, under that, they just get to keep doing this (indicating) because they can only make a right turn. They can't go home.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Signage possibly modified to "no trucks."

MR. YOVANOVICH: I think what we need -- we need to prohibit -- I'm sorry, Terri. We have to prohibit people who are using our site from taking a left onto Myrtle.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: For rental vehicles.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Right. Yeah, no rental vehicles shall take -- shall use Myrtle -- shall use -- take a left. It's right turn only for rental vehicles. I think that's what you want, because you don't want to prohibit people coming home from being able to take a left.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thanks, Mike, for clarifying.

MR. YOVANOVICH: That was --

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: And I can work with Mr. Yovanovich on all of these conditions to make sure that they reflect what our understanding of your motion is.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: And possibly a final one is to have the Board take into account allowing the staff to work with the -- not plaintiff. I'm sorry. It could be -- with the petitioner for making sure the exit onto Myrtle is the best interest for all parties, the residents, safety, fire, ambulance and/or people using the U-Haul. And I don't know how we word that, but just making sure that's on the record that the staff will do a deep dive reviewing that entrance/egress onto Myrtle.

With that, I'm satisfied with our conditions. Anybody have anything else, or shall we move to a vote?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Was that a motion?

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: That was a motion.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: That was a motion.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Second it.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Second.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: We have a second.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Motion and second.

Commissioner McLeod, you did have your light on. Did you have something on add? I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you. So there's a first and second. All in favor?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Any opposed?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye (delayed response.)

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: No.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Joe?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Were you for or against?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I'm for.

MR. YOVANOVICH: For, okay.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: He's okay with it.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: All right. Motion approved.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: I voted no.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Could you please state your reason for the negative vote?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Well, I'll try. I don't know if it passes muster.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: That's okay. It helps the Board of County Commissioners in their review.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: If it doesn't pass muster, then I abstain. I am moved by the feelings of the residents. I doubt that this is an asset to the area, and I'm not in favor of the unchecked spread of storage facilities. That's why I vote no.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Okay. Moving on. Next item is old business. Do we have any old business? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Chuck.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: This is Commissioner Schmitt again. The resident who spoke up about there's a significant amount of land east on the Trail, I would encourage that citizen to talk to the county staff. Mike Bosi, I think if you can share the Future Land Use Map and indicate that though it appears there's a lot of land to the east, there are certainly very significant restrictions with the Rural Fringe and Rural Land requirements and other things. So I'm not going to get into that now, but I think that it would be educational for that -- when that issue was brought up, to understand that it isn't what one would appear if you drove down the East Trail. It's very restricted.

Anyways, thanks.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Chair.

Old business. Any old business?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: No.

Any new business?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: No.

Is there any public comment on any item that would like to be heard that is not on the agenda?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: No.

With that --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: State when our next meeting will be.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: Our next meeting will be December 19th?

MR. BOSI: December 19th.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: December 19th will be our next meeting at 9 a.m., which Chair Schmitt will be at.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: He better be.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: He's greatly missed by all.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: You've done a great job. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: But you've done a good job. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: The last meeting was 58 minutes. I thought that was perfect. This one -- Chair Schmitt said there was a softball. I'm not letting him get off that easy. Forget it. We don't want to deal with this, so...

MR. BOSI: Chair, you just made the three-hour mark, so I think we could wrap it, right?

CHAIRMAN SCHUMACHER: I thank God for that.

With that being said, we'll stand adjourn, and I wish everybody a very Happy Thanksgiving.

\*\*\*\*\*

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 12:00 p.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

*Joseph K. Schmitt*

\_\_\_\_\_  
JOSEPH K. SCHMITT, CHAIRMAN

These minutes approved by the Board on \_\_\_\_\_, as presented \_\_\_\_\_ or as corrected \_\_\_\_\_.

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED ON BEHALF OF FORT MYERS COURT REPORTING BY TERRI L. LEWIS, RPR, FPR-C, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC.