

# DIVISION OF PLANNING

## MEMORANDUM



# LEE COUNTY

S O U T H W E S T F L O R I D A

**to:** Tim Jones, Assistant County Attorney  
**from:** Paul O'Connor, AICP, Director of Planning  
**subject:** Hanson Report/Greater Pine Island Community Plan Update  
**Tuesday's Board of County Commission Agenda**  
**date:** September 24, 2004

Thank you for sending me a copy of Mr. Hanson's response to the questions submitted by Wayne Daltry. Unfortunately, Mr. Hanson's response does not provide answers to several of the most significant questions.

The conversion of any agricultural operation to a residential development requires extensive modifications to both the land itself and the water management system. The question that has not been addressed is what are the differences in residential development costs comparing existing practices versus the "density recapture" option? While Mr. Hanson states that this issue "is of great importance" he fails to provide an answer.

The level of service limitations on Pine Island Road that are currently established under Objective 14.2 are not addressed by the response. These limitations severely restrict the amount of new residential development allowed on Pine Island. In addition, one of the stated purposes of the Greater Pine Island Community Plan Update was to provide a relief valve to these existing policies by allowing continued residential developments at reduced density. The response does not take these relief efforts into account.

The response includes two instances where Mr. Hanson agrees that certain factors overlooked by his methodology would reduce some of the forecasted monetary impacts stated in his report. His response, however, does not quantify these effects.

In the Bluesheet for Tuesdays Agenda Item, Option 1 is take no action, Option 2 calls for the repeal of the Coastal Rural portions of the plan amendment and Option 3 calls for a repeal of the entire Greater Pine Island Community Plan Update amendment. A fourth option for consideration would be to increase efforts to resolve the issues with a settlement agreement. Items for consideration could be to repeal the 157 acre change from Outlying Suburban to Coastal Rural and to consider reducing the percentage of land required for restoration in Coastal Rural. Planning Staff is also concerned about the public participation in these various options. The amendment has been adopted and found to be in compliance by the Department of Community Affairs. The statutory process for amending the plan, including Local Planning Agency and Board of County Commissioner public hearings, should be followed.

*cc: Board of County Commissioners  
Donald D. Stilwell, County Manager  
Mary Gibbs, Director of Community Development  
Wayne Daltry, Smart Growth Director*