Commentary: FGCU Master Plan

Written submittal April 15th, 2011 Public Hearing
Ann Pierce/ Citizen Advocate, BikeWalkLee

Outlined within FGCU’s Vision and Mission statements are the goals of becoming a University of “national prominence” and one that “practices and promotes environmental sustainability”. Within the larger context of current academic and societal trends these two goals cannot exist in isolation from one another, in the development of a young university the former is no longer attainable without the latter. The current Campus Master Plan does little to address true sustainability and if not altered will set FGCU on a path of mediocrity.

Good stewardship and environmental sustainability are mentioned frequently within the document. Specifically, the University has charged itself with demonstrating “responsible leadership and innovation by infusing environmental sustainability throughout critical dimensions of University life and community interactions.” To that end the Campus Master Plan addresses the more salient issues of damage avoidance to, and mitigation of, local, sensitive wetlands, and promotes building energy conservation, specifically building to LEED certification. Left out however, is comprehensive integrative of planning for land use, housing, open space development, and host community compatibility with transportation, energy use, regional environmental and air quality and long-term economic factors. In sum, this is simply another iteration of a traditional non-sustainable plan with a bit of ‘greening’.

True sustainability is impossible to “infuse” as an add-on. It must form the genesis from which subsequent plans emanate and requires complex, integrative, whole-system thinking and planning. Certainly this is known and accepted within the academic disciplines at FGCU, and it is entirely unacceptable that the Campus Master Plan should incorporate to such a lesser degree a comprehensive understanding and reflection of those principles of sustainability.

The University campus as laboratory is not a unique idea, but few universities are in so enviable a position as FGCU to be so early in their stages of development, and thus retain the opportunity to incorporate at all levels of research, planning, implementation and accountability the breadth of deep sustainability. Such an approach would require a rigor of discipline and coordination that is quite beyond the level of understanding reflected in this Campus Master Plan. Such an approach however, would be in keeping with the stated mission of the University and the higher level learning and academic research expected from one wanting to attain “national prominence”.
Recommendations:

- Recommit to living out the delineated goal of “increasingly becoming a force for positive change in Southwest Florida through leadership and actions of faculty, staff and students.” Do not leave the level of achievement in attaining this goal to a poorly done outsourced master plan.

- Rethink the Campus Mater Plan utilizing Complex, Whole-Systems approaches which address environmental sustainability issues at the appropriate temporal, geographical (impacts beyond the University boundaries) and economic scales to achieve integration of the now disparate plan elements.

- Utilize the expertise and modeling available from other campuses and academics, including those within the Florida University system, e.g. the Rinker School of Construction and Dr. Charles Kibert, University of Florida – Gainesville

- Consider that construction ecology is much more than a prescription based LEED certification, and while LEED is valuable and does add a recognizable cache, it may no longer be the single best choice.

- Endeavor to attain the performance based measurements of Factor 10 and Regenerative design in all new buildings. These require the integration of whole-site, whole-environment, planning.

- Borrow from and extend the principles of Integrated Design Processes used in sustainable construction as a prototype model for the process of development of a better Campus Master Plan.

Refer to: Vol I. 3.0 Urban Design Elements
Vol II. Mission Statement
Vol II. Goal 105, Goal 106, Goal 107

- Align comprehensive transportation planning with that of the host community, specifically the Lee County Evaluation Appraisal Review, its incorporation of complete streets policies, and the MPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan. Reflect the community’s commitments to enhanced safety and accessibility of walking, biking and transit.

- Move beyond auto-centric planning and facilities building to a fully integrated policy of multi-modal transportation development, delivery, marketing and incentivization, with a focus on interconnectivity both on-campus and within the host community. Specifically address the addition of bike planning; bike lanes into and around campus, bikeways, and bike storage facilities.
• As in building energy use and conservation, set definable, measurable thresholds in moving away from being an auto-centric campus. Utilize the full complement of transportation demand management techniques available.

• Again, access resources from other universities that are successfully addressing this same issue, University of Washington at Seattle, University of California at Davis, and Stanford University, Texas A&M.

• Consider that parking garages, even when built with “sustainability in mind such as using reflective materials, incorporation of solar panels and incorporation of ‘green’ walls” are not sustainable choices when built without intelligent integrative transportation planning. They are perhaps even worse than just non-sustainable in that this green washing approach engenders cynicism, all too alluring to college age youth.

Refer to: Vol I. 3.0 Urban Design Element
          Vol I. 11.0 Transportation Element
          Vol I. 12.0 Intergovernmental Coordination Element

• Minimize the use of impervious surfaces in walkways, bikeways and roadways. Select from among the several viable materials that provide adequate hard, drivable surfaces and still allow water permeability.

• In every building project, plan for and implement LID or Low Impact Development techniques. These can minimize the need for more expensive retention and detention areas, provide greater flexibility in current and future land use, create a more natural landscape and augment larger, regional wetland and estuary environmental restoration efforts.

• In meeting the requirements for storm water mitigation and in keeping with LID and the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, as well as to provide cooling to building and parking areas...plant trees, lots of them, in copse and groves, rather than just ornamental plantings.

Refer to: Vol I. 1.0 Academic Mission of the University
          Vol I. 13.0 Conservation Element

Because sustainability is only a mirroring of our actual interface with innumerable, multiple-scale biological and chemical natural systems, systems that are always ‘on’, continually operating and reacting with or without our consent, and because we have only begun to understand the vastly complex, interconnected and hierarchical nature of these natural systems, systems upon which life depends, universities must advance themselves as leaders in the rigorous academics of Sustainability studies,
experimentation and implementation. They must assume roles of bold and prescient leadership in their communities, states and nations. FGCU must accept this leadership role in Southwest Florida as put forth in its Vision and Mission statements, for the betterment of the whole by creating a Campus Master Plan of excellence.
Testimony
Public Hearing on the FGCU Master Plan Update
Donald F. Eslick, Chairman, Estero Council of Community Leaders (ECCL)
April 15, 2011

- We greatly appreciate the opportunity to comment on the 2011 FGCU Master Plan Update

- Since 2002 the Estero Community has had a County approved Community Plan...our community organizations have extensive experience with land use planning...and are very supportive of good planning

- We appreciate your focus upon the 760 acres that you control in the core of the University but are disappointed to see that for all intents and purposes the planning stops at the campus border

- Getting a rapidly expanding population of students, faculty and staff to and from the campus requires good coordinated transportation planning between FGCU, local community groups, the MPO, LeeTran and others

- Likewise the absence of a plan for off-campus housing for students, faculty and staff forces the use of many acres of valuable campus academic land for dormitories and dining halls...even if the 25% standard is the appropriate level

- Contrary to the consultant's report there are several sizeable pieces of vacant land quite close to the University that are comparable in size and location as Coastal Village, the only remaining privately owned student housing development housing 800 students on 25 acres.

- Although many of these properties are currently zoned commercial they have been sitting vacant for several years and some have changed hands as a result the ongoing recession. With the support of the Community some of these properties may well be rezoned, if
necessary, to satisfy University needs, whether that is for student, faculty or staff.

- During the last 10 years the Estero community in cooperation with the Lee County Commissioners has rezoned over 11 million square feet of commercial property in our small community. Since 2002 about 4 million square feet of that development has been built...that leave us with over 7 million square feet remaining. In my opinion that is more than we will ever need and the property owners know that as well.

- There will never be a better time than now to determine how some of these lands might be used to satisfy University needs. Their prices are way down from 2005 and the many of the owners are sick and tired of paying the carrying costs on these properties.

- If such a strategy proves workable it could have a big impact on the future planned use of FGCU’s core campus, reducing the amount of on campus student housing and providing more space for academic growth beyond 2021.

- Such an effort may help us to jointly avoid problems created by groups of students living together in small apartments or single family homes in communities not designed for student housing. In recent years three residential communities have asked us what other communities have done to manage the noise, parking and other problems created by such living arrangement. If we are to have off-campus housing around FGCU it needs to be planned, built and managed with that use in mind.

- We look forward to working with you to expand the scope of this plan so that it addresses off campus traffic and housing issues as well as on campus impact of the University’s continued growth while adjacent land is still available to satisfy many or your growth needs.

[Signature]

4-15-2011
Darla Letourneau/BikeWalkLee
Talking Points: FGCU Master Plan
April 15, 2011

- BikeWalkLee, a coalition to complete the streets in Lee County, works for a more balanced transportation system.
- Lee County, through the MPO and the BoCC, has made progress over the past 2 years on putting in place long-term plans and policies that promote sustainability, better land use & transportation planning, with a focus on multi-modal transportation, complete streets & more livable Lee County.
- Our expectation:
  - The university would not only develop a master plan consistent with these county plans & vision, but
  - FGCU would be a recognized leader in sustainability, transportation, and livability within Lee County and the Southwest Florida region.
- FGCU draft Master Plan is major disappointment and needs to be amended.

Following are specific comments & recommendations:

1. **Consistency with Lee County Comprehensive Plan (Lee Plan)**
   - **Background:** The Lee County Evaluation and Appraisal Review, adopted March 1, 2011, focused on five issues that were identified as primary drivers of needed changes to the land use plan. The relevant sections of the plan were to: Take Care of Lee County (e.g., quality of life and economic development) and Connect People to Places (reinforce complete streets and integrate all aspects of transportation form and function).
   - **Recommendation:** The FGCU Campus Master Plan should be consistent with this focus and provide incentives and disincentives for connectivity and alternative transportation. Universities have more leverage & tools than any other employer or organization to make this happen. FGCU needs to LEAD (like many other universities around the country have done, with great success—Davis, CA, Boulder, CO, etc.)

2. **Consistency with MPO countywide bike/ped master plan**
   - **Background:** The MPO LRTP, to be adopted on May 20th, will include adoption of a major countywide bike/ped master plan which includes 3 demonstration projects, one of which is bike lanes & signage on a University Loop, that will promote bicycling by students & others both to university & to errands—shopping, errands, social life—off campus. Critical that FGCU be a partner in this effort.
Recognize that parking as an objective should be balanced with other campus needs, such as future academic buildings and the natural environment.

- Use the price of parking as a disincentive to drive to campus.
- Making parking convenient and within a close walking distance creates incentives to drive. While distribution of parking spaces around campus is a good idea, the sole purpose should not be to minimize walking time for users.
- Allow for parking facilities to not only increase, but to decrease as well. This would give the campus more flexibility as transportation demand management programs begin to work.

Specifically, the following sections and GOPs should be addressed:

- Vol. 1; Section 3.2 Existing Campus Environment
- GOAL 1101 - Provision of On-Campus Parking Spaces; Objective 1101.1
- Policy 1101.1.6

5. Recognize Sustainability and Transportation Programs within Lee and Collier County

- Recognize the Lee County Office of Sustainability, the MPO Complete Streets Resolution, and the Lee County Complete Streets Resolution and Program, and the Lee County Transit Task Force as programs that enhance the quality of life.

Specifically, the following sections and COPs should be addressed:

- Vol. 1. 4.5.4: Quality of Life:

6. Strengthen Campus Commitment to Sustainability

- Recommendation: Add a policy that recognizes the contributions that a mode-shift from the single-occupancy vehicle to other alternative modes of travel (bicycling, walking, etc.) can make to a sustainable campus. Document should also recognize importance to lowering students’ cost of college education by eliminating necessity of owning car (which costs $9,500/year to maintain) to be FGCU student.

Specifically, the following sections and COPs should be addressed:

- Vol. 1. 4.5.4: Quality of Life

Darla Letourneau
Steering Group
BikeWalkLee
a coalition to complete Lee County’s streets
dleto@bikewalklee.org
239-850-3219
www.BikeWalkLee.org
blog: http://www.bikewalklee.blogspot.com/
Gulf Coast University is a growing part of The Lee County community. It is growing and we applaud the University for its planning for the future.

But we suggest that its draft master plan is myopic in that you are only considering the obvious internal transportation needs and implications.

We would hope that the University would use this process to reach out to the non university community, to find how they feel the community outside the gates of the university will be affected by the university's planned growth.

As we understand the mission statement of the University, it is devoted to being a steward of the environment and to care of the precious lands the University sits upon.

Your master plans calls for using much of your limited property for student housing and parking and in doing such will limit the amount of space available for educational facilities.

The plan also shows that the current University population generates 6,198 daily trips and projects that in 2015 the population will grow to 19,000 generating 42,810 daily trips.

Even if the University's projection are correct and you can handle all those cars on campus we suggest that by allowing, or even encouraging, this use of cars you are not being a good steward of the lands nor a good neighbor to the community at large.

We would have expected that you would have planned for ways of reducing the carbon footprint of the university. There are many ways you could have planned to move students to and from the campus without increasing the daily trips of automobiles by over 30,000 trips a day. Some of the possibilities might include:

- Not allowing Freshman, Sophomores and maybe even Juniors from having cars on campus (which many Universities do)
- Charging substantially higher parking fees to discourage driving of cars

And then supply alternative methods of getting students onto the University campus, such as:
• Partnering with public transit systems in Lee and Collier counties to bring students to campus, and consider incentives, such as free bus passes

• Shuttle service to and from the University from student housing complexes off campus

• Shuttle service to and from the University from offsite parking lots located in areas MAYBE 10 MILES TO THE North, South and West of the campus (dictated by where students live). This would allow those students who live a distance for the campus to drive a shorter distance reducing the use of gas and reducing the congestion on the roads.

These are just some of the possible areas that we feel should be incorporated into the University's master plan and we would hope the University would reach out to community groups like ours to look for ways to be a good steward of the lands you occupy.

April 15, 2011
April 15, 2011

Florida Gulf Coast University
Attn: Master Plan Update
10501 FGCU Blvd, South
Fort Myers, FL 33965-6565

To Whom This May Concern:

On behalf of Collier County Audubon Society (Collier Audubon), which has many members in Lee County and advocates on conservation and land use affairs in connection with Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary, I write to offer substantive comments on the proposed Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU) Master Plan update proposal for 2010-2020. We are very appreciative of the opportunity to comment through this planning process. Collier Audubon has reviewed the Master Plan Update and generally urges FGCU to incorporate more proactive objectives to increase the sustainability and self-sufficiency of the campus and operations of FGCU. These proactive measures should include:

- Comprehensive planning for and use of transit for transportation needs
- Energy efficiency achieved through land use and transportation planning aimed at reduction of Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT)
- Provision of maximal services needed by students, faculty and staff on or accessible to campus
- Conversion of the campus from parking lot lakes to a predominantly residential campus and student body, with commuters accommodated on the periphery and bused in.

More specific comments follow:

Goal 105: Add requirement to maximize campus self-sufficiency. Include also under Goal 401

Objective 301.5: Need to be more proactive, rather than just review or coordinate with surrounding University Community development. There needs to be an added policy requiring campus community and University Community charrette planning exercises when land use changes are being consider.

Objective 301.7 and Goal 105: Energy Efficiency and Sustainability: Add requirements to reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) through land use planning, transit, and self-sufficiency.

Goal 401: Put this deletion back in – Criteria are needed for growth and land use changes.
Objective 401.1: Rather than aspire to only be consistent with permits and regulations, FGCU should aspire to be MORE protective of resources and look for restoration opportunities.

Goal 402: Need proactive planning for transit to facilities and services. Put commuters on the periphery and bus in, while limiting parking lots in the center of campus. Transition FGCU from a commuter school to a residential school.

Goal 1101: Change to reduce parking on campus while simultaneously providing adequate transit service to substitute. Revise land uses on campus and the periphery accordingly.

Objective 1103.1.1: Add required coordination with Collier County on external transit services to the campus in addition to coordination with Lee County.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on FGCU’s Master Plan update. Please contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Bradley Cornell
Southwest Florida Policy Associate
April 14, 2011

Dr. Joseph Shepard, Ph.D.
Vice President for Administrative Services and Finance
Florida Gulf Coast University
10501 FGCU Boulevard South
Fort Myers, FL 33965-6565

RE: Campus Master Plan Update

Dear Dr. Shepard:

I am writing on behalf of Miromar Lakes, LLC. Miromar Lakes, LLC is an “affected person” as that term is defined in Section 1013.30, F.S. Miromar Lakes, LLC (“Miromar”) and the owners and residents in Miromar Lakes are the “persons” most affected by Florida Gulf Coast University (“FGCU”).

Section 1013.30(3), F.S. provides that each element of the Campus Master Plan must address compatibility with the surrounding community. The draft Campus Master Plan often references the need for the surrounding community to be compatible with FGCU, but that is not the correct application of the statute. The University is required to be compatible with the surrounding community. Miromar would respectfully submit that the Campus Master Plan falls short in its obligation to be compatible with the community that surrounds the University.

The University and the surrounding area were originally part of the same comprehensive plan amendment. The plan amendment provided for residential uses around the University. Dr. Charles B. Reed, the former Chancellor for the State University System of Florida, wanted to limit commercial and other uses around FGCU. Miromar Lakes is an approved Development of Regional Impact (“DRI”). The DRI provides for 2,600 residential units. The property is also zoned as a Mixed Planned Development. A copy of the approved Map H and the approved Master Concept Plan are attached hereto and made a part hereof. There are several instances where the proposed Campus Master Plan suggests that there is no need for the University to be compatible with Miromar Lakes and in fact Miromar should be designing its project to be consistent with the proposed Campus Master Plan. This is completely contrary to the Florida Statutes. An example is Policy 301.5.2, which provides that the University will “consider” in their design any specific plans for adjacent private development if and when that occurs, to avoid undesirable impacts of the private development on the proposed university housing.” First, there are specific plans for Miromar Lakes and there have been specific approved plans since the original DRI approval on November 29, 1999. Secondly, the University has an obligation to address compatibility now and not just “consider” doing it some time in the future.
Section 1013.30(3), F.S. also provides that the Campus Master Plan must not be in conflict with the comprehensive plan of the host local government. The host local government is Lee County. The Lee County Comprehensive Plan in Policy 5.1.5. specifically provides that new development must "protect existing and future residential areas from any encroachment of uses that are potentially destructive to the character and integrity of the residential environment." The adverse impacts are to be addressed through buffering if possible, but if that is not possible then the use should not be permitted if it is going to negatively impact the "existing and future residential areas". The proposed Campus Master Plan does not provide an adequate buffer between university uses and the residential to the south. The proposed Campus Master Plan eliminates areas that were set aside for upland and wetland protection that previously addressed compatibility with the future residential areas in Miromar Lakes. The plan proposes intense uses such as recreational fields and parking structures too close to the boundary with Miromar Lakes without adequate buffering and attention to light and noise pollution. There are current recreation and parking facilities with intense lighting that violate the Lee County regulations for lighting and which produce a light trespass on private property. The damage caused by the light trespass is not speculative, it is documented. Miromar objects to the continuation of the noise and light nuisance, and the creation of additional instances of light and noise pollution. Miromar submits that it would be a violation of the Lee County Comprehensive Plan and the Campus Master Plan regulations to permit the location of any new development that is incompatible with the approved residential community.

Miromar has provided a list of Objectives, Policies and Figures that are of concern. The list is attached hereto and made a part hereof. The Campus Master Plan is required to be consistent with the state regulations which would include Chapter 187, F.S. the state comprehensive plan. The state plan submits that Florida shall (mandatory) protect private property rights. The University as a state agency has an obligation not to create a nuisance or trespass on private property. A nuisance is an act or omission that "annoys, injures or endangers the comfort, health, repose or safety" of a person's life or property. The University by and through its Campus Master Plan has an obligation to ensure the protection of adjacent private property and to ensure adequate buffering and the prevention of noise and light trespass. It has been found that a cause of action does exist for the installation of lights that lack proper shields or which are otherwise constructed in a manner that causes a nuisance or annoyance. Rodgers v. City of Miami Springs, 231 So. 2d 257, and Hale v. Zeder, 17 So. 2d 426. In Downey v. Jackson, 65 So. 2d 625 the court found that the lights from a recreational field caused a nuisance. The court found that the appropriate legal remedy is an injunction if the light trespass cannot otherwise be remedied. Miromar Lakes submits that the Campus Master Plan should require the development of the areas adjacent to Miromar Lakes to be accomplished in a manner that is compatible and in a manner that does not cause light and noise pollution and trespass.

The proposed amendments to the Campus Master Plan do not ensure compatibility with the adjacent private property as required by the Florida Statutes. Miromar would respectfully request the Trustees make the necessary amendments to the proposed Campus Master Plan to provide the required compatibility.
Dr. Joseph Shepard  
April 14, 2011  
Page 3 of 3

Your consideration of this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Neale Montgomery, Esq.

cc: The Honorable Frank Mann, Lee County Commissioner  
Mr. Mike McDaniel, Department of Community Affairs  
Mr. Jerry Schmoyer, Miromar Development  
Mr. Mike Elgin, Miromar Development

Attachments List:

1. List of Objections  
2. Conservation Areas Exhibits  
3. Berm Section A-A Detail  
5. Figure 4-1 (2010 Plan)  
6. Figure 8-1 (2010 Plan)  
7. Miromar Lakes Approved Map H and Master Concept Plan
ATTACHMENT 1

List of Objections
LIST OF OBJECTIONS

(Proposed language is shown in underline and objectionable language is struck-through)

Objective 105.1 Energy Conservation, and the policies that implement this objective speak to leadership in energy conservation and environmental sustainability. It is inconsistent with this objective and the ensuing policies to continue to promote light and noise pollution that adversely impacts residential and conservation areas off-site when the University is obligated to ensure compatibility.

Objective 301.5 is labeled “Compatibility of the University/Host Community Boundary and Context Area”. The University is required to be compatible with the context area, which includes Miromar Lakes. The objective does not require compatibility it only requires the University to “consider” the land use plans for adjacent private development.

The University, in Policy 301.5.1. submits that the University wants to work with the adjacent landowner on the southern access, which is Miromar. Miromar welcomes a working relationship that provides adequate protection for the residential areas.

Miromar objects to the uses identified in Policy 301.5.2. if there are no provisions for adequate separation, lighting standards, and buffering to ensure compatibility. The policy identifies housing, recreation, and support services as the appropriate uses, but the policy does not require compatibility. The University is only required to “consider” whether or not they want to avoid undesirable impacts on private development. Policy 301.5.2. should be rewritten to require compatibility. Miromar recommends that it be revised to read as follows:

Develop the southeastern parcel with housing, recreation, and support services as described in the Future Land Use Element that consider r-e. Consider in their design any specific plans for adjacent private development if and when it occurs, to avoid any undesirable impacts of private development on the proposed University housing.

Develop the southeastern parcel with uses that are compatible with the adjacent low density residential uses. All recreation, housing and support services must be separated from the adjacent residential community with a minimum 100 foot densely planted buffer. (See Exhibit “3“). There shall be no light or noise trespass or other undesirable impact on the adjacent private residential community. There shall be zero foot-candles of light at the southern property boundary and there shall be no more than 20 kilo candelas at the property line prior to 10 p.m. and .5 kilo candelas at the property line between 10 p.m. and 7:30 a.m.

Policy 301.5.3. submits that buildings will be developed in the southeast parcel and buffers will be provided “where appropriate” between the campus edge and adjacent parcels. This policy should be rewritten to require buffers.
Policy 301.5.3. Develop buildings All development in the southeast parcel must:

a. Providing where appropriate, adequate landscaped buffer zones between the campus edge and adjacent parcels. Provide a minimum 150 foot separation of all buildings from the southeast property line, no building shall be constructed in excess of 35 feet in height.

b. Providing perimeter open space buffers as shown in the conservation element map to maintain a landscaped campus edge. Provide a minimum 100 foot densely landscaped buffer that provides for upper and mid-story vegetation consistent with the attached Exhibit "3".

c. Locate all recreational fields a minimum of 250 feet from the property line.

d. All lighting shall be shielded and shall be consistent with dark sky regulations. No recreational field lights shall be developed at a height greater than 35 feet, and street lights shall be limited to a height of 20 feet. A photometric analysis must be done to ensure no light spillage on adjacent conservation areas and areas under private ownership, this will require a showing that there will be no more than zero foot-candles of light at the property line and 20 kilo candelas of glare between the hours of 7:30 A.M. and 10:00 P.M. and .5 kilo candelas from 10:00P.M. to 7:30A.M.

e. Locate all parking structures in excess of 35 feet a minimum of 200 feet from the southern property line. All lights on the parking structure shall be shielded and installed with full cut off luminaries that do not create any light pollution on adjacent privately owned lands and conservation areas. Lights on the parking garage must meet the light standards in section d. above.

Objective 401 speaks to the protection of natural resources. Figure 13-4 from the 2005 plan identifies extensive wetland areas and upland preservation areas adjacent to the residential area in Miromar Lakes. Figure 13-4 in the proposed 2010 plan obliterates the wetland and upland areas which is inconsistent with the protection of natural resources. It is the conversion of the upland and wetland conservation areas that creates significant and severe compatibility issues. (Figures 13-4 from the 2005 and 2010 plans are attached hereto for your consideration.)

Objective 401.2 provides for the development of the campus in accordance with Figure 4-1 attached hereto. Figure 4-1 does not provide for compatible development and adequate buffers and separation of University uses from private development. (Figure 4-1 is attached hereto for your consideration.)

Policy 401.2.4. submits that the southeastern area is to be developed with one million GSF of building. One million square feet is inconsistent and incompatible with a low density residential community if there are no mandatory requirements for adequate building separation, adequate buffering, and adequate attention to building placement and light and noise pollution.
Objective 402.1 provides that the University will eliminate or minimize compatibility issues with the host community. The amendment seeks to eliminate the sentence, “Ensure that development of land uses on the University Campus is coordinated with land uses and development in the host community” that ensures greater compatibility. The language should not be stricken. Lee County is the host community and Miromar Lakes is located inside the host community and the Campus Master Plan is internally inconsistent. The plan when taken as a whole does not eliminate or minimize compatibility issues. The second sentence should be retained as noted below:

Objective 402.1: Eliminate or minimize land use compatibility problems between the University and the host community. Ensure that development of land uses on the University Campus is coordinated with land uses and development in the host community.

Objective 402.2 submits that the University should deter off-site development that would limit the University’s ability to develop whatever it wants. The Objective suggests that rather than address the University’s obligation to be compatible, the University should act to deprive adjacent landowners of their reasonable approved use of the land which would be a taking without just compensation.

Objective 402.2: Deter actions off-campus that would constrain or limit future development on the University Campus. This Objective shall not be interpreted in a manner which deters or limits any development adjacent to the University that has an approved Development of Regional Impact development order.

Policy 402.2.5 submits that the University is going to develop University functions on the perimeter of the campus to ensure compatibility of on-campus development with future off-campus development. The plans sought to be approved as part of this Campus Master Plan update are inconsistent with this policy. The policy should be reworded as set forth below.

Policy 402.2.5: Do not develop University functions on the perimeter of the campus, as described in Policies 301.5.1-301.5.4 unless adequate buffers, building separation and lighting standards are met to ensure compatibility of on-campus development with future off-campus development.

Policy 501.1.3(a) submits that no new facilities will be developed on the lakefront except for additional recreational fields. This policy should be amended to require any recreational fields on the lakefront to be developed with lights that meet dark sky requirements and which do not create off-site noise and light pollution.

No major new facilities are envisioned to be constructed in the lakefront mixed-used parcel over the 10-year planning period, with the potential exception of athletic-related facilities such as a softball clubhouse or soccer facilities. Any new lakefront recreational fields shall not install lights at a height greater than 35 feet. The lights shall not exceed zero foot-candles of light at the property line. The lights shall not produce glare that
exceeds 20 kilo candelas from 7:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 5 kilocandela from 10:00 p.m. to 7:30 a.m. New street lights along the lake front shall not exceed 20 feet in height.

Policy 601.4.4. states, “locate intramural and intercollegiate playing fields to enhance campus edges and improve vistas to the campus.” This policy is inconsistent with the requirement to be compatible with adjacent private property. The private residential community does not want vistas to the campus and they do not want the playing fields located on the campus edges. An appropriate buffer is absolutely necessary to ensure compatibility and to prevent light and noise pollution. This policy conflicts with policy 301.5.3.

Policy 601.4.4.: Do not [locate intramural and intercollegiate playing fields in a manner that adversely impacts adjacent private property owners and conservation areas. Dense buffers should be used to enhance campus edges and restrict vistas to campus.]

Policy 701.2.5. provides for residential student housing to be a minimum of four to six stories in height. The height and massing of the residential student housing and associated parking structures is inconsistent and incompatible with the adjacent private residential community. Setbacks from perimeter boundaries should be established to provide for separation and security and to avoid shading, and light, noise and visual pollution and trespass.

Policy 701.2.5.: To make efficient use of limited developable campus land but still take advantage of cost-competitive construction methodologies, new student housing should be built at heights of at least four stories but not more than six stories, with some three- and five-story building elements provided for visual variety. No buildings over 35 feet should be permitted within 150 feet of the private residential community.

Objective 801.2 and Policy 801.2.2. provide for the development of recreation and open space amenities in accordance with Exhibit 8-1 which is attached hereto. Objective 8-1 provides for a recreation center with unidentified uses, and multipurpose recreational fields adjacent to the private residential community. The location of the student garden and other less obtrusive uses in this location would be more compatible. Miromar objects to the adoption of Figure 8-1. (Figure 8-1 is attached hereto for your consideration.) The recreational fields are objectionable in large part because of Policy 801.2.4. which provides that the facilities will be “lighted for night-time play.” The lights for night-time play in proximity to a private residential community are objectionable and incompatible, unless the lighting, building separation, and buffering standards outlined herein are incorporated into the campus master plan.

Policy 801.2.8.: On an annual basis, review with the Lee County Planning Department, the status of existing planned and proposed recreational facilities on the University campus and adjacent context area under public ownership. Based on this review, modify University plans and policies for recreational facilities to ensure the efficient and timely provision of these facilities. The review process outlined in this policy shall not be utilized to locate recreational facilities closer to private landowners than is permitted in the Campus Master Plan.
Policy 1501.2.2. b. submits that the Campus Master Plan should provide for "a campus edge condition that permits landscape rather than architecture to dominate." Miromar supports this policy and submits that the proposed plan is not consistent with this policy.

Policy 1501.3.4.B. provides for a "plan for lighting and unobstructed horizontal vision and landscaping that permits easy visual communication while limiting light onto neighboring properties, wildlife areas and into the night sky." Miromar appreciates the addition to this policy and would submit that the lighting plan shouldn't limit light spillage and trespass; it should prevent light spillage and trespass. The policy should be written to provide:

*Develop a plan for lighting and unobstructed horizontal vision and landscaping that permits easy visual communication while limiting prohibiting light spillage and glare onto neighboring properties, wildlife areas and into the night sky.*

Policy 1501.5.2. provides for signature buildings that have a height of eight stories. Miromar supports the location of taller signature buildings in the academic core; eight story buildings should not be constructed in proximity to the context area.

*Policy 1501.5.2.: The University should consider the creation of taller building elements (five to eight stories) in limited locations—the academic core to create “signature” architectural statements, in alignment with Policy 1501.4.1. No buildings taller than five stories shall be permitted within 500 feet of the south property line.*
ATTACHMENT 2

Conservation Areas Exhibits

Figure 13-4 Environmental Mitigation Basin 4 – 2005 Plan
Figure 13-4 Future Conservation Basin 4 - 2005 Plan
Figure 1-1 Master Plan Illustration - 2010 Plan
ATTACHMENT 3

Berm Section A-A Detail
Buffer to be Type 'F' at a minimum of 100' in width
As defined in LDC Sec. 10-416

Minimum 5 Trees per/100'
Hedges must be planted in double staggered rows
and be maintained so as to form a 36 in. high (Type F buffer
must be 48 in. at installation and be maintained at 60 inches high)
continuous visual screen within one year after time of planting.

Section A-A DETAIL
Buffer to include Earthen Berm at minimum of 100' in width.
Slopes to be Min. 3:1 and densely planted
ATTACHMENT 4

Figures 13-4

Future Conservation Basin 4 - 2005 Plan
Future Conservation Basin 4 - 2010 Plan
Future Conservation Basin 4

Legend
- Wetland Areas
- Upland Retention and Buffer Areas
- Excavated Lakes
ATTACHMENT 5

Figure 4-1
2010 Plan
ATTACHMENT 6

Figure 8-1
2010 Plan
ATTACHMENT 7

Miromar Lakes
Approved Map H and Master Concept Plan
April 15, 2011

Chair, Campus Master Plan 2005-2015
Florida Gulf Coast University

Re: Public Hearing on FGCU Master Plan Update
April 15, 2011

I am a Community Representative to the Estero Council of Community Leaders representing Pelican Sound in Estero. I am also a Director on the Estero Community Planning Panel. Although I am unable to attend the public hearing, I am most appreciative to have the opportunity to review and comment regarding the update of the FGCU Master Plan and wish to provide the following comments:

- Estero is a community boarding FGCU and is impacted by FGCU’s transportation and transit planning. Estero’s major roads and side roads accommodate significant traffic generated by students, faculty, and staff going to and from the university.

- FGCU’s Master Plan calls for 75% to 80% of students living off campus. In ten years, that would approximate over 15,000 students traversing local roads in addition to staff and faculty and guests.

- Policy 701.1.4: This policy calls for a "University Housing Coordinating Committee". I recommend a representative of the Estero Community Planning Panel be appointed to this committee.

- Objective 1103.2 – Reduce Dependence on the Single-Occupant Vehicle
  - The plan should call for a survey/study to determine the travel destinations of commuters to and from FGCU’s main campus with the intent to plan for transit hubs/stops to accommodate commuters. Such a study should be done in cooperation with the Lee County Transit Department.
  - The survey/study should estimate the number of commuter trips on all local roads in Lee County. This information may also be helpful in determining areas best suited for off-campus housing.
  - I agree on-campus parking should be administered to “encourage the use of public transit services and other non-automobile transportation.” (Policy11034.1.6) I support suggestions to negotiate fares for students and
faculty to encourage use of the transit system. I would encourage a review of your parking fees to ensure they do not encourage driving as opposed to using public/other transportation. The fewer areas used for parking increases the space potential for education and other program facilities.

- **Policy 1103.2.4:** In addition to seeking FDOT funding for off-campus park and ride programs, I encourage a coordinated effort with Lee County Transit to seek funds for such programs.

- All transit programs should be coordinated with the Lee County Board of Education. FGCU and the Board of Education have mutual and comparable needs to help reduce transportation/parking costs to the university/public schools and to the students/citizens of Lee County. Transit systems that reduce the number of vehicles on the road provide reduced road maintenance/construction costs, environmental benefits, and reduced costs to those who can avail themselves of transit systems and leave the vehicles at home. More effort should be focused on mutual planning to combine the needs of both organizations in transit planning.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments,

**John Goodrich**

John E. Goodrich, Jr.
JEG
PUBLIC INPUT TO AGENDA ITEMS

Florida Gulf Coast University
Public Hearing of the Campus Master Plan Update 2010
April 15, 2011

Name: JEFFREY ROMAN

Address: 3506 SE 4th Pl
Cape Coral, FL 33904

Comment Item: - COMPLETE STREETS MISSING FROM EAR
- Look into more Transit Options & Transportation Demand Management.
- Stop incentivizing the use of cars (via more parking garages) & start incentivizing transit options
- Limited land on campus means less room to expand & higher cost of future parking
- Make it more affordable for students to attend FGCU by not needing a car to get here.

- Strongly encourage meeting w/ Citizens Advisory Committee to Lee Co. MPO - new connection between Lee & Collier Co. Bus Systems.

Signature & Date 4/15/11
PUBLIC INPUT TO AGENDA ITEMS

Florida Gulf Coast University
Public Hearing of the Campus Master Plan Update 2010
April 15, 2011

Name: Edwin Everham

Address: 9135 Morris Rd

Ft. Myers, FL 33967 (San Carlos Park)

Comment Item: General Comments
(Specify)

Thank you for careful scheduling, and
thorough advertisement to encourage
community participation.

We need to expand our focus
to include the larger landscape
to meet our needs and goals.

I also appreciate the public
presentation to Faculty Senate.
This facilitates their understanding of
the process and will encourage participa-

Signature & Date
PUBLIC INPUT TO AGENDA ITEMS
Florida Gulf Coast University
Public Hearing of the Campus Master Plan Update 2010
April 15, 2011

Name: Lisa B. Beever
Address: CHINR, 1926 Victoria Ave, FM #33901
lbbeever@swflpc.org

Comment Item: 
1. Host Charlotte geared to students and faculty
2. Staff invited to address main campus and other FGCU properties
3. Increase efficient use of building footprint, e.g., commercial space
4. Mean building around parking garages for offices, classrooms
5. Implement low-impact development techniques using LID
6. Sarasota County manual
7. Set Impervious area. Suggest 15%
8. Install solar panels on impervious needed for others uses rather than new impervious
9. More efficient use of existing parking, e.g., shuttle to/low headways @ GCTC + Miramar
10. Covered walkways

Signature & Date: Lisa B. Beever 4-15-2011
PUBLIC INPUT TO AGENDA ITEMS

Florida Gulf Coast University
Public Hearing of the Campus Master Plan Update 2010
April 15, 2011

Name: Nicholas BATOS

Address: 9165 Hollow Pine Drive
          Estero, FL 34135

Comment Item: (Specify)

Oral Testimony

Written

Signature & Date 4/15/11
PUBLIC INPUT TO AGENDA ITEMS

Florida Gulf Coast University
Public Hearing of the Campus Master Plan Update 2010
April 15, 2011

Name: EDD WEINER

Address: 20048 LAKE VISTA CIRCLE
LEHIGH ACRES, 33936

Comment Item: THE MASTER PLAN SHOULD INCLUDE A TIMELINE FOR USING THE BUCKINGHAM PROPERTY FOR CLASSROOM PURPOSES (NURSING & ALLIED HEALTH SERVICES) TO BE COORDINATED WITH CLINICAL TRAINING AT LEHIGH REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER. THIS TIMELINE SHOULD BE SOONER THAN LATER. - USING THE CAMPUS FOR "TRACE" OF GOLF PURPOSES" IS NOT A GOOD USE OF THE PROPERTY

Signature & Date
04/15/11
Name: EDD WEINER
Address: 20048 LAKE VISTA CIRCLE
          (Unit Apt Acres 33936)
Comment Item: EXTERNAL TRANSPORTATION - LEE TRAN IS A MUST FOR IMPROVED COMMUNICATION - CHARGING OR PROHIBITING STUDENTS FROM DRIVING IS IMPOSSIBLE IF THERE IS NO WAY TO GET TO THE UNIVERSITY. THE COUNTY & LEE TRAN HAVE TO STEP UP TO THE PLATE & FIND FUNDING.

Signature & Date: 04/15/11
Note: Demere
- Low impact development
- Buildings around garage
- More mixed-used around garage
- Reliance on automobile
- Concern we are not incorporating outdoor facilities
- Gather feedback from external groups
- Bi-annual workshops
  - Thoughtful, deliberate