

REZN-24-000006

Hideaway Beach Association, Inc.

Marco Island City Council – May 6, 2024

On Behalf of the
Applicant:

Zachary W. Lombardo
Woodward, Pires & Lombardo, P.A.

Requested Amendment

Applying for an amendment to the PUD language in Collier County Resolution 92-11, as amended, to:

- Add **bocce, golf course, and playground uses** for parcel numbers 50037760004 and 50037720002
- Add **bocce, pickle ball, and playground uses** to the golf course tract
 - Allow for golf cart parking consistent with PUD standards



Hideaway
Parcel
Numbers
50037760004
and
50037720002



Hideaway Beach Golf Course Tract



Amendment Language

4.03 Permitted Uses and Structures

A. Permitted Principal Uses and Structures

1. Single Family detached dwellings.
2. Solely as to Lots 1 and 2, Block 18, Hideaway Beach:
 - i Bocce Courts.
 - ii Golf Course.
 - iii Playgrounds and playfields excluding Pickleball, Tennis and other racket related uses.

4.03 Permitted Uses and Structures (Cont.)

B. **Permitted Accessory Uses and Structures**

1. Customary accessory uses and structures, including private garages and private docking facilities as specified in Section 4.04.10.
2. Solely as to Lots 1 and 2, Block 18, Hideaway Beach -
 - i Recreational facilities, including but not limited to Bocce Courts, Golf courses, playgrounds, and playfields, that serve as an integral part of a residential development and have been designated, reviewed, and approved on a site development plan or preliminary subdivision plat for that development excluding Pickleball, Tennis and other racket related uses.
 - ii Signs as permitted in the Land Development Code.
 - iii Golfcart parking.

4.04.09 Off-Street Parking Requirements:

- A. One parking space shall be required for each dwelling unit and such space shall be located within the building setback line.
- B. Bocce Courts - 1 space per court.
- C. Golf Course – 2 spaces per golf hole.
- D. Up to 40% of the required parking spaces may be golf cart-type vehicle parking spaces in paved or unpaved areas.

6.02 Permitted Uses and Structures:

No building or structure, or part thereof, shall be erected, altered or used, or land used, in whole or in part, for other than the following:

A. **Permitted Uses**

1. Golf course
2. Golf and Tennis Pro Shop and Club House
3. Tennis, ~~and~~ Pickle Ball, Racquetball, Bocce Courts and Courts any other general recreational use which is comparable in nature with the foregoing uses.

6. Playgrounds and playfields

6.03 Plan Approval Requirements:

A. General Requirements

3. ~~Tennis and racquetball courts~~ Tennis, Pickle Ball, and Bocce courts shall be set back a minimum of 45 feet from abutting ~~private street pavement edges and~~ residential structures (except maintenance personnel living quarters).
4. A minimum of 6 tennis courts ~~and 2 racquetball courts~~ shall be provided.

6.07 Minimum Off-Street Parking:

Golf course, including ~~(incl. Golf and Tennis Pro Shop and Health Clubhouse and Golf Clubhouse)~~, ~~Tennis and Racquetball Courts~~ Tennis, Pickle Ball, and Bocce Courts – two (2) spaces per golf hole and 1 space per court. Up to 40% of the parking spaces may be golf cart-type vehicle parking spaces in paved or unpaved areas.

Convenience Commercial – 1 space per 250 square feet of gross floor area. The director may permit a lesser number of parking spaces to be paved when circumstances indicate infrequent use. However, these unpaved parking spaces shall be grassed and reserved for future paving. Notwithstanding the foregoing, up to 40% of the required parking spaces may be golf cart-type vehicle parking spaces in paved or unpaved areas.

The background of the slide is a blue-tinted image of a desk. In the foreground, there are several white, spherical objects with curved lines, resembling stress balls or decorative spheres. Below them, a blueprint or architectural drawing is spread out on the desk. Several pencils are scattered around, some pointing towards the center. In the upper left, a portion of a calculator is visible. The overall scene suggests a professional or academic setting.

Adopt Staff and Planning Board Recommendation of Approval

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria

1. Whether the proposed change will be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies and future land use map and the elements of the growth management plan

- Hideaway's PUD pre-exists Marco Island
- Proposed amendment **does not change density** or cause there to be intensities outside of the permitted range of land uses already existing
- Consistent with Future Land Use Element Policy 3.2.7

Evaluation Criteria

2. The existing land use pattern

- The existing land use pattern in the area impacted by this amendment is **residential** and **residential, recreational amenities**

Evaluation Criteria

3. The possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts

This amendment:

- Does **not** create a new district
- Does **not** change district boundaries
- Extends residential, recreational amenity uses adjacent to **already existing** residential, recreational amenity uses

Thus, this amendment will **not** create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.

Evaluation Criteria

4. Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property for the proposed change

- Existing neighborhood boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to the existing conditions
- Existing area in which recreational amenities may be constructed is smaller than what was originally planned
- Multiple variances have been granted that found sufficient buffering between existing recreational facilities and the nearby single-family homes

(Collier County Resolutions 95-589 and 90-530)

Evaluation Criteria

5. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary

6. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood

Changed conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary:

- Hurricane Ian
- Hideaway's Growth
- Changing recreational amenities market

The proposed amendment will **positively** impact the living conditions in the neighborhood because it will allow for an updating of recreational amenities

Evaluation Criteria

7. Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or create types of traffic deemed incompatible with surrounding land uses, because of peak hour volumes or projected types of vehicular traffic, including activity during construction phases of the development, or otherwise affect public safety

- Modifications to **existing** recreational amenities
- Hideaway is a **gated** community
- All roads in the vicinity are **private** roads
- The facilities serve **existing** residents

Therefore, Traffic impacts should be **negligible**.

Evaluation Criteria

8. Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem

- All modifications will be subject to site planning for review of drainage matters

9. Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas

- No more than what is currently possible

Evaluation Criteria

10. Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area

- **No**

11. Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accordance with existing regulations

- Majority of adjacent property is already adjacent to recreational amenities
- Variances have been granted to allow locations **consistent** with all amendments for existing courts

Evaluation Criteria

12. Whether the proposed change will constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual real property owner as contrasted with the public welfare

13. Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accordance with existing zoning

- The property owner is an association **composed of all Hideaway owners** and in that way represents the interests of the entire neighborhood

- There is a **need** for additional recreational amenities and there are **no other viable sites** given current property ownership and build out present in the Hideaway neighborhood

Evaluation Criteria

14. Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city

- The existing area in which recreational amenities may be constructed is **smaller** than what was originally planned

15. Whether it is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in districts already permitting such use

- **Yes**

Evaluation Criteria

16. The physical characteristics of the property and the degree of site alteration which would be required to make the property usable for any of the range of potential uses under the proposed zoning classification

- The proposed allowable uses are **minimal in impact** compared to the impact of what could otherwise be constructed

Evaluation Criteria

17. The impact of development on the availability of adequate public facilities and services consistent with the levels of service adopted in the city comprehensive plan and as defined and implemented through the city's adequate public facilities ordinance, as amended

- The proposed allowable uses are **minimal in impact** compared to the impact of what could otherwise be constructed

Evaluation Criteria

18. Such other factors, standards, or criteria that the city council shall deem important in the protection of the public health, safety, aesthetics, and welfare

- The applicant is an elected board of the **members of the neighborhood** that this proposed amendment impacts
- The board, and by extension the neighborhood, believes this to be in the **best interest** of the neighborhood



Questions?

