

— GREATER PINE ISLAND COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE —
SYNOPSIS OF AND RESPONSE TO SUGGESTIONS
FROM THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2001, PUBLIC PRESENTATION

SYNOPSIS OF SUGGESTION:	COMMENT:	CHANGES MADE:
1. SUGGESTIONS BY LEO AMOS		
a. <i>A third lane on Pine Island Road through Matlacha would be bad for Matlacha.</i>	a. Page 8 describes the many negative effects of adding a third lane.	a. NONE
b. <i>How would the section on signs affect Matlacha?</i>	b. See page 30 and 31; mainly, buildings within 15 feet of a right-of-way would now be allowed to have wall-mounted signs.	b. NONE
c. <i>The section on municipal incorporation doesn't address what would happen to the new sewer plant after incorporation.</i>	c. The answer to this question should be added to the plan.	c. Added a comment on page 33 that ownership and operation of the sewer plant would likely be retained by Lee County Utilities
d. <i>Where is the definition of the new "Coastal Rural" land-use designation?</i>	d. The definition is contained in proposed Policy 1.4.7 on page 17.	d. NONE
e. <i>The plan repeatedly uses the phrase "Pine Islanders" – which seems to exclude Matlacha.</i>	e. This was not intentional; however, adding the word "Greater" to every use of "Pine Islanders" would be somewhat cumbersome (though more accurate).	e. Rephrased the narrative on page 1 to indicate that when the phrase "Pine Islanders" is used in this plan, it refers to all residents of Greater Pine Island.
f. <i>Why are buildings on Galt Island allowed to be taller than elsewhere on Pine Island?</i>	f. Phil Buchanan explained the history behind this question on September 19. This plan update contains the same height limits for Galt Island as for the rest of Greater Pine Island.	f. NONE

SYNOPSIS OF SUGGESTION:**COMMENT:****CHANGES MADE:**

2. BURGESS ISLAND**a. Jack Brugger** (also distributed letter)

- i. *Burgess Island is included in this plan without any analysis.*
- ii. *The “Coastal Rural” designation may be challenged under the Bert Harris Act.*
- iii. *The discussion of 70% habitat protection doesn’t reflect the amount of land needed to meet SFWMD detention requirements.*
- iv. *The proposed commercial standards require “large” windows, but the new building code will make them very expensive.*
- v. *The modified height limit is measured from minimum flood elevation.*
- vi. *The septic tank program (page 37) cannot be completed within one year.*

- i. Burgess Island was specifically included in the inventory in Appendix C.
- ii. This potential for such a challenge is discussed on pages 14 and 15.
- iii. These requirements should be acknowledged in this plan.
- iv. Any conflicts between great building types and the new Florida Building Code will be resolved when writing the new architectural standards.
- v. The basic height limit would not change; it is not measured from flood elevation, nor should it be.
- vi. Agreed; only the design of the program is expected in one year (see wording on page 37)

- i. NONE
- ii. NONE
- iii. Modified narrative on page 15 and Tables 4, B-1, and B-2 on pages 16, B-5, and B-6 to reflect these requirements.
- iv. NONE
- v. NONE
- vi. NONE

b. Richard Donnelly (also distributed letter from Alliance of Bridgeless Islands of Lee County, Inc)

- i. *Let the bridgeless islands decide for themselves if they want to be in this plan or out of it; keep this decision at the local level rather than letting the county commission decide.*

This plan contains nothing that would support a recommendation to change the boundary. A landowner’s wish is not a sufficient justification for the community to recommend modifying the boundary. A boundary change would not only exclude a piece of land from this plan update, it would exclude it from the *existing* Pine Island plan.

NONE

c. Tom Munz (via letter)

- i. *Please delete Burgess Island from your plan.*

SYNOPSIS OF SUGGESTION:**COMMENT:****CHANGES MADE:**

3. SEPTIC TANKS ON CANALS

- a. **Eric Soronen:** *Why does the septic tank section need to be in this report? It could split the community between those with new septic systems and those with older systems, and could open a huge can of worms by suggesting there might be a public health hazard in our canals.*
- b. **Phil Buchanan:** *Keep the septic tank section in the report; this question of sewers will go forward either without local data or with the local data we can collect.*

- a. and b.
There is no requirement to address this subject. It is a voluntary effort to learn more, and ultimately to influence the outcomes if contamination of canals is actually occurring. If this plan ignores this subject, others will control this decision and Pine Islanders will be forced to simply respond.

- a. and b. NONE

4. G.P.I. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

- a. **Sally Tapager** (also distributed letter): *This plan shouldn't advise Lee County as to the types of businesses we need or would welcome on Pine Island; pages 9, 10, and A-10 seem to do this.*
- b. **Elaine McLaughlin:** *The listing of "hotels" on the chart on page 10 conjures up the image of incompatible chain hotels, while Pine Island would welcome small or bed-and-breakfast inns.*

- a. The only purpose of the chart that divides businesses into two types was to identify certain commercial uses that would almost never increase traffic on Pine Island Road through Matlacha. It was not intended to imply that businesses in the left column were desirable or that businesses in the right column were undesirable.
- b. This chart was not intended to suggest that small or bed-and-breakfast inns were unwelcome on Greater Pine Island.

- a. Modified the text and chart on pages 9, 10, and A-10 to avoid the impression expressed by the Chamber of Commerce letter, while retaining the list of business types that would be presumed to serve residents and existing visitors and thus be unlikely to increase traffic on Pine Island Road.
- b. Added text on page A-10 acknowledging small inns as desirable Pine Island businesses.

SYNOPSIS OF SUGGESTION:**COMMENT:****CHANGES MADE:**

5. CHERRY ESTATES (Mike Roeder on behalf of Kevin Cherry (also sent letter):

a. *Cherry Estates has been under development for several decades but is not yet completed. Certain desirable changes (such as converting mobile home lots to conventional house lots) might be blocked by potential interpretations of Policy 14.2.2.*

a. This plan was not intended to interfere with completion of legitimate ongoing development projects, especially with changes that would improve such projects.

a. Modified proposed changes to Policy 14.2.2 (page 10) to add this sentence: These development regulations may provide exceptions for legitimate ongoing developments to protect previously approved densities for final phases that have a Chapter 177 plat or site-plan approval under Ordinance 86-36.
