

**MINUTES REPORT  
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY  
March 25, 2002**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Noel Andress  
Susan Brookman  
Ron Inge

Gordon Reigelman  
Robert Sheldon  
Greg Stuart

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Rick Burris, Planning  
Ben Chumley, Planning  
Donna Marie Collins, Assistant County Attorney  
Timothy Jones, Assistant County Attorney  
David Loveland, DOT  
Janet Miller, Recording Secretary  
Matt Noble, Planning  
Paul O'Connor, Planning Director  
Gloria Sajgo, Planning

**Agenda Item 1 - Call to Order, Certification of Affidavit of Publication**

Mr. Inge, Chair, called the meeting to order. Donna Marie Collins, Assistant County Attorney, certified the affidavit of publication and submitted same to the record.

**Agenda Item 2 - Public Forum**

Debra Forester with the Bonita Bay Group discussed Administrative Code 13-3, which was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in June entitled, "Administrative Procedures Governing Community Planning Efforts Receiving Financial Support from the Board of County Commissioners." She explained that after this administrative code was adopted in June, a group of professional planners, attorneys, and engineers met informally to review the program and the code. After several meetings, the group prepared recommended changes to the code to strengthen the process by guaranteeing the involvement of the citizens and ensuring that the County-wide interests are maintained or improved through sound planning principals. This group of professionals felt the same steps outlined in the code should apply to all community plans whether or not the community group received any funding from the County. She distributed a draft of the changes proposed for this administrative code and reviewed them with the Local Planning Agency Board.

**Agenda Item 3 - Approval of Minutes – February 25, 2002**

Ms. Brookman moved to approve the February 25, 2002 meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Reigelman. There being no further discussion, the motion passed 6-0.

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Local Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP)**

The Local Planning Agency Board was previously mailed a document entitled, "Lee County Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP) for State Fiscal Years 2002/03-2004/05. Ms. Sajgo explained that the County was required to produce a new housing assistance plan every 3 years. It is a requirement to bring this plan before the Local Planning Agency so it can be found to be in compliance with the Lee County Comprehensive Plan. She stated this plan was taken before the Local Housing Assistance Committee in November of 2001. After that meeting, three workshops were held to discuss the selection criteria. The Local Housing Assistance Committee approved the plan this past March. Ms. Sajgo reviewed the principal changes in the plan. A general question and answer segment followed.

Mr. Roeder from Knott, Consoer, Ebelini, Hart & Swett and Chairman of the Home Ownership Resource Center stated he was in favor of the plan overall and hoped the Local Planning Agency would approve the document. However, he noted that even though there was an increase in funds allocated to rehabilitation efforts, it was only 13% of the total amount the County receives. He did not feel this figure was adequate for rehabilitation efforts even though the figure has tripled from previous allocations. Mr. Roeder stated that although he was in favor of the plan, he would like to see the County put a priority on spending the SHIP dollars in the County's older neighborhoods and explained his rationale. He also discussed problems with the bonus density program. Mr. Roeder stated he felt the County was heading in the wrong direction with that portion of the plan and hoped the Local Planning Agency would review this issue at some future time.

Mr. Sheldon requested that Mr. Roeder submit his request in writing to the Local Planning Agency, so they would have more specifics and be able to review the request.

**Mr. Stuart moved to find the Lee County Local Housing Assistance Plan in compliance with the Lee Plan, seconded by Mr. Andress. There being no further discussion, the motion passed 6-0.**

#### **Agenda Item 5 - Review and consideration of Proposed Lee Plan Amendments**

Mr. Inge informed the public that today's meeting was an informational gathering and that no formal actions would take place. He noted that staff reports would be prepared for next month's meeting. He stated that if anyone was interested in receiving these staff reports, they should contact the Lee County Planning Division.

##### **a. CPA2001-09**

Mr. Noble asked members of the public who wished to receive a notice from the Department of Community Affairs to enter their name and address into the record. Staff distributed revised language recently submitted by the applicant on this project. Mr. Noble stated that the representatives to the steering committee would speak on this subject.

Mr. Roeder, consultant on the Steering Committee, stated the following:

- The Steering Committee spent last summer developing a community plan for their area, which is privately funded. He provided background information to the Board.
- Due to a meeting with County staff last week, changes were made and additional policies added to the original plan. He referred the Board to the underlined portions of the plan that were distributed to them at today's meeting. He reviewed some of the changes with the Board
- Mr. Roeder felt the plan was similar to the Buckingham plan and believed the land use map was acceptable. He noted they were keeping the land use category and densities the same as they are currently.
- He noted that mining and commercial excavations were not appropriate in the Bayshore community.
- He stated that Section 20.2 caused some controversy because of the extension proposed for Nalle Grade east of 31. The community believes this extension is not needed and would cause serious dysfunction to the area. He noted they held a large meeting on June 6, 2001 at the Lee County Civic Center in which over 400 people attended.

General questions, answers, and discussion followed.

Mr. Stuart referred to Policy 20.3.1 and suggested the policy include the interstate/interchange areas.

Mr. Roeder felt this was a good point and stated it would most likely be added in the language.

Mr. Ric Pritchett, resident of Alva, stated the following:

- Mr. Pritchett stated he was not in favor of this amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
- He noted that in 1985 there had been comprehensive plan changes made to the Future Land Use Map from which a Future Trafficways Map was approved. He felt that people based everything they did on these future land use maps and future roadways. However, with this new proposal, these future roadways will be eliminated. He stated that he, personally, would like to see his roads widened at some point in the future.
- He also reviewed concerns he had with the interchange areas of the plan, for instance, where it stated that no commercial development could occur in the interchange areas.
- He also had the understanding there could not be any future plan amendment changes. He asked if there could be industrial land use changes in this plan.

Ms. Collins stated there could not be any industrial land use changes as proposed.

- Mr. Pritchett noted that years ago his family developed the only industrial park in this area mainly for the purpose of transportation corridors. He was also concerned about economic development efforts in Lee County stating it would be difficult to create better jobs without potential industrial land use changes.
- He expressed concerns with eliminating mining.
- Finally, he noted that he was aware of several property owners that were not contacted about this proposal.

Mr. Loveland stated that from a standpoint of the 2020, there were no roads affected by this plan and he reviewed the various roadways with the Board. He noted staff did have some concerns with the prohibitions on some road improvements in this area. He stated that the upcoming staff reports would include staff's comments and recommendations related to the conditions being proposed.

Randy Banks, property owner in North Fort Myers and other areas of Lee County, stated the following:

- He discussed his assessment of the June 6th meeting, which he attended. He noted he was not notified of the meeting and that he had learned about it from the ad in the newspaper.
- He stated that the Steering Committee seemed to be self appointed and that he had not been given an opportunity to vote. He noted that the Steering Committee had been upset over a proposed mine. The mine application included rock blasting and rock crushing. He believes the Bayshore Plan was a "knee jerk" reaction to that application submittal.
- He did not agree with comments made by Mr. Roeder that the majority of the attendees at the June 6th meeting were in favor of the plan. He felt that the Steering Committee and Mr. Roeder put down on paper what they wanted and did not feel the plan represented the majority. Mr. Banks did not feel there had been due process.
- He noted he had read in the paper that Wayne Daltry would be in charge of the Smart Growth Committee. He believed the Smart Growth Committee should look at the County as a whole and not break the County into little pieces.

Mr. Mark Penfield, member of the Bayshore Steering Committee, stated the following:

- The effort did initially start with the mining issue. He explained that the community was very upset over this issue and decided a committee should be formed in an effort to address and protect the Bayshore area.

- He noted there had been a lot of public notice regarding the June 6, 2001 meeting and that approximately 400-500 people attended. Mr. Penfield noted he specifically sent information to Mr. Pritchett and Mr. Banks to their home and to their office. He also noted that Mr. Banks was there.
- He believed that very few were against the policies proposed in the Bayshore plan. He noted they took a vote on each and every item in the plan and that there had been an overwhelming response to the changes. At the end of the meeting, the consensus from the public was that a second meeting was not necessary.
- He stated the Bayshore Steering Committee would be happy to work with staff and meet with Mr. Pritchett and Mr. Banks. However, the meeting would be regarding the Bayshore plan and not the mining issue. Mr. Penfield felt that if a meeting was held regarding the mining operation, there would most likely be approximately 2,000 people in attendance.
- He noted the citizens of this area were not in favor of widening the roads and having them extended. When large developments are put in place, they will be responsible for putting in their own roads.

Mr. Dan Moser, Chairman of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee for Lee County, requested that as the Local Planning Agency reviews these community plans in general that there be certain provisions made to include a bicycle and pedestrian element. He noted that Captiva had dropped these provisions from their plan. He did not understand how or why this took place since Captiva Island has a high amount of pedestrians as well as many bicycle users. He felt it was an oversight if the Local Planning Agency accepts a plan without these provisions.

Ms. Jeanne Cornele, member of the Bayshore Steering Committee, stated she was a 27 year resident of the Bayshore area and a 42 year resident of Lee County. Ms. Cornele explained that she moved to this area for the rural lifestyle. She felt that Lee County was losing their lands that have been used for equestrian and agricultural activities. She and her neighbors became involved with this committee to preserve that lifestyle. Ms. Cornele felt that broad based mailings had taken place and stated that Mr. Penfield could provide the Local Planning Agency with that list. She felt that every effort had been made to contact as many people as possible.

Mr. Arnold Sarlo read a statement on behalf of the Babcock Florida Company: "As long time land owners in the area, Babcock believes that issues such as hurricane evacuation and regional access are critical and that transportation business and planning experts must have the ability to respond to such needs. Therefore, we object to limiting the improvements of State Road 78."

Mr. Butch Ritter, member of the Steering Committee, stated that he, like many others, bought residences in a rural area. He felt this Plan addressed a very small area (approximately 13,000 acres).

He did not understand why the County would want to throw an industrial park in the center of 13,000 acres that are primarily comprised of equestrian owners with farms, stables, and barns, which provides training to a lot of youth. He noted that many citizens were concerned about having a child on a horse, while mining activities were taking place. He noted that loud noises could easily spook a horse and injure a child or an adult. He agreed with Mr. Penfield that the community wants to see the Plan stay as it is.

Mr. Roeder stated the Committee looked forward to working with staff to address some of the issues raised at today's meeting. However, he noted there seemed to be the idea that they were going to be able to receive total consensus on this plan, which he felt was not practical or realistic. He stated the same would be true for the efforts of the Smart Growth Committee. He stated that clearly there would be some land owners who would not agree with the results, but the main issue is where the public interest and community good lies.

**b. CPA2001-10**

Mr. Mudd distributed some changes to the Captiva Island Community Planning effort.

Mr. Dave Depew, planner for the Captiva Community panel, gave some history of Captiva and their planning efforts. He stated this Plan was a first cut at a series of amendments to the Lee Plan and that they would be looking at another round of amendments in the future to further address some of the issues, for instance, pedestrian and bike paths. He explained that the mechanism to improve bicycle and pedestrian access is restricted due to serious physical problems with rights-of-ways where these pedestrian/bike facilities could be placed. He noted there were a number of proposals in the amendment that suggest "additional effort must be undertaken." He reviewed some of these with the Local Planning Agency. Mr. Depew noted that over the course of the last year and a half, there had been several public hearings and meetings held. They also received input from surveys. Mr. Depew announced there would be another meeting held tomorrow afternoon with the Captiva Community panel and the Captiva Civic Association Land Use Committee. He also announced that two new members have been appointed to the Captiva Community Panel making it a 9 member panel.

General discussion and answers followed.

Matt Uhle, representing the Captiva Civic Association, distributed a handout and reviewed it with the Local Planning Agency. He also provided some background information regarding this process and what individuals had been involved. He provided background on the Captiva Civic Association who has existed since 1959 and has approximately 630 members. He provided history on the group represented by Mr. Depew. Mr. Uhle reviewed the plan prepared by the Captiva Civic Association. Mr. Uhle stated that a public workshop was held and as a result of the input received some changes had been made to the plan. This revised plan was mailed out and the people of Captiva were asked to comment. He referred the Board to the summary page and noted that none of the policies received less than 82% support.

In Mr. Uhle's opinion, his group's version of the plan was the true community plan for Captiva. He explained their intention was to present this plan to the Community panel and urge them to work with this document since it clearly represents the sentiment of the community.

Mr. Stuart urged the two groups to work together and come to some sort of compromise.

Mr. Andress agreed that the two groups should work together so they would have a unified plan and consensus instead of different plans.

Mr. Uhle stated that since his group had gotten endorsement from the citizens on the Island, his ability to negotiate was limited. However, he stated he was willing to work with them.

A general question and answer discussion followed.

Mr. Steve Hartsell, Pavese Garner Law firm, representing Mariner Properties (the agent for Plantation Development Limited and Meri-Star Hospitality Corporation) stated the following:

- Mariner Properties are the owners and operators of land and property of South Seas Resort on Captiva. Mariner has been working with County staff for several months providing a significant amount of historical data and information with regard to past approvals and permits for South Seas Resorts.
- He believed that some of the issues that have been raised would be addressed in the near future including South Seas' acknowledgment and acceptance of the density cap of 912 dwelling units. South Seas Resort proposes to clearly define the limits of the commercial development area in the entrance of South Seas Resort. South Seas proposes to significantly limit any future development in the mangrove wetland areas.
- Mariner and Meri-Star have reaffirmed their prior commitment to preserve 80 acres of wetlands and to dedicate more than 100 acres of these sensitive lands to third party stewardship entities in the near future.
- South Seas has proposed building height limitations that will preclude any possibility of high rise or mid rise types of developments. Mariner and Meri-Star both support the concept of community plan, particularly one that acknowledges the historic pattern of development over the past 30 years on Captiva. They also appreciate the focus on important community wide issues, like road improvements, beach renourishment, landscaping, preservation, native vegetation, all which can and should be done in a way that preserves the unique character and charm of Captiva.
- Mr. Hartsell stated his clients had concerns with some of the proposals that have been made with regard to the policies, particularly with regard to limitations on how the public hearing processes are going to take place. He explained how this policy would affect businesses.

c. **CPA2001-18**

The meeting recessed at 10:15 a.m. and reconvened at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Inge announced that he had a client who had an interest in a property on Pine Island Road and, therefore, had a voting conflict. He announced he would abstain from voting on this issue, but would be allowed to participate in the discussion since he had filed the Voting Conflict form early.

Matt Noble stated this was a request to amend the Future Land Use Element of the Lee Plan to incorporate the recommendations of the Greater Pine Island Community Planning effort. He noted this effort had been ongoing for the several years. He distributed a document from Bill Spikowski, the community's planning representative/consultant.

Mr. Bill Spikowski stated the following:

- The memorandum that Mr. Noble distributed was a response to various review comments. He gave background on the Greater Pine Island Community Plan. He then reviewed several new issues that came up, such as an influx of agriculture since 1990 and the desire to expand into some of the community character issues that had not been dealt with in the earlier plans.
- Most importantly, they wanted to reexamine the traffic plan because the traffic count had reached 810 on Pine Island Road, which was the number in the 1989 plan and once that number was reached, the rules would be changing. He noted this plan was financed by private funds raised by the Civic Association as well as their treasury. In addition, the County contributed a \$5,000 grant. He noted they also received grants from the Florida Department of Community Affairs.
- He explained that the Civic Association took on the role of sponsoring the plan, but they did not try to control the outcome. Mr. Spikowski outlined the advertising efforts expended to notify citizens of this community planning effort and plan. He reviewed 5 of the most important elements in the plan.
- He mentioned one area south of Bokeelia (157 acres) that had been converted totally to agriculture since the previous plan was adopted. Mr. Spikowski stated they were recommending that the area be changed back to rural.
- He discussed other environmental issues on the island, such as the rule that new developments must stay back 50 feet from the aquatic preserves. He noted that agriculture was never included in that rule. Mr. Spikowski's group feels this is an oversight, which should be corrected.
- He discussed community character issues and stated his group felt that more attention should be given to designating additional properties of historic merit.
- He noted that septic tanks and building heights were big issues on Pine Island.



- Lastly, he noted his group did a fair amount of analysis on Pine Island's transportational turns that could be done short of building a new road to Pine Island. He noted there had been a lot of negative reaction to their pro and con analysis. He reviewed this with the Board.

Mr. Stuart referred to the community character issue and noted that Bokeelia was distinct from St. James City, and that both Bokeelia and St. James City were distinct from Matlacha. Therefore, when it came time to get into the actual Land Development Code Community Character rules, he felt there should be a way to distinguish the specific needs and characters of each of these areas. He also discussed inner buffers, which he felt was an interlocal issue. He discussed concerns he had with this section. He noted there should be some language in this Plan or in the Lee Plan that deals with looking at air boats and jet boats. He referred to the water quality items and felt this was a good start, but would need some additional work.

General questions, answers and discussion followed.

Mr. Bill Spikowski stated the County's ad for this plan next month would need to include a map that shows not only the boundary of Greater Pine Island, but the boundary of that property.

Mr. Inge discussed Policy 14.3.5 (Page 25) regarding the walls and gates. He asked if this would be better placed in the Land Development Code rather than Comprehensive Plan. He also had concerns that this section might be overly burdensome.

Mr. Matt Uhle, representing a number of agricultural land owners in Pine Island, stated he was not here to complain about the process. He felt a good job had been done as far as reaching out to the public. He noted that the materials had also been on Mr. Spikowski's website making the information readily accessible. He reviewed substantive problems he had with two sections (coastal rural category and the special concurrency section, particularly the 910 threshold).

Lengthy discussion ensued.

Mr. Stuart discussed the Level of Service D, which he noted was a level of service above what the typical concurrency level of service would be. He wanted to ask DOT staff what the residual capacity of the road would be if the level of service was lowered. He asked staff to pass this question along to DOT staff.

Mr. Richard Jones, Bokeelia resident, representing the Alden Pines Homeowners Association, read the following statement into the record:

"The membership of the Alden Pines Homeowners Association unconditionally supports the revised version of Goal 14 of the Lee County Comprehensive Land Use Plan as submitted by the Greater Pine Island Land Use Committee. We applaud the hard work of the volunteer Land Use Committee for its dedication, expertise, and perseverance in revising this plan to reflect the interests of Greater Pine Island residents. We have been

fully informed of its efforts and sincerely hope you will support the plan as written. Signed by the Chairman of the Autumn Pines Homeowners Association.

Mr. Max Hughson, resident of Bokeelia, representing the Captains Harbor Condominium group (a 76 unit condominium), read the following letter into the record:

“It is my pleasure to report that the Board of Directors of the Captains Harbor Condominium Association voted unanimously to endorse the proposed land use plan for Pine Island. We ask that the Local Planning Agency recommend approval of the plan as currently proposed to the County Commission.”

Ms. Barbara Dubin, resident of Bokeelia and Chairperson of the Land Use Committee, believed the Greater Pine Island Plan was done primarily due to hurricane problems and to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents on the Island. She reviewed the advertising processes that took place explaining that they invited and encouraged all resident and property owners to participate. She noted that each time the land use revisions were updated, they were printed out and placed in the Pine Island Library, Realty World in Matlacha, and Bill Spikowski’s website. These updates were also distributed to everyone during the public meetings. She reviewed where they had received funds for the creation of this plan. She stated they had minutes from all of the meetings in writing and on tape and even had a County representative attend their committee meetings. She requested the Board approve this plan.

Mr. Michael Roeder, representing Cherry Estates, stated he worked on the 1989 plan and felt this proposal was a good, clear document. He referred to Page 3, Policy 14.2.2, and felt this section was not as clear as it should be. He discussed a situation that arose for Cherry Estates who had two undeveloped islands (8 & 9) and did not have development orders. He asked for some clarifying language that would recognize recorded plats and an 86-36 site plan approval as being protected. Mr. Roeder noted that his project was a platted subdivision and that they would not be changing the density. He was not satisfied with the language “may provide exceptions” and felt there should be stronger language. He stated that Mr. Spikowski noted this was a work in progress and that he was not certain how many of these cases are out there. Mr. Roeder felt that by now we should be able to do the research to see if there are other plats and other 86-36 approvals. He believed the County could inventory this information.

Mr. Stan Tracy, Resident of Bokeelia, stated that during the 19 years he and his wife have resided on Pine Island, they have enjoyed the environment and the ambiance of the island. He felt this proposed plan was an instrument in preserving a valuable and precious way of life. He noted that although there might be different points of view about this proposed plan, he doubted anyone would disagree that they do not want to see the same rapid growth that has occurred in other areas happen to Pine Island. He noted that some of the road expansion plans in addition to rumors of major development projects, has raised red flags. He believed now was the time to act and do something to prevent this uncontrolled development from happening to their area. He believed the limitations of this document would prolong life and preserve the fragile landscape and a precious way of life. He urged the Board to approve the document.

Mrs. Chris Troast stated she and her husband lived in Bokeelia for nearly 10 years and decided to participate in the process to create the community plan because they felt it was the most important thing they could do for their community. Mrs. Troast found the process to be thorough, fair, and inclusive and the resulting community plan to be representative of Greater Pine Island. Mrs. Troast noted that growth was inevitable, but she felt that it was the responsibility of citizens and law makers to ensure that growth is reasonable and environmentally sound, which she believed the Greater Pine Island Community Plan would accomplish.

Ms. Elaine McLaughlin, resident of Bokeelia, discussed the signage issue. Since Pine Island is a rural community, she felt they needed rural solutions and not be treated with a "one size fits all" mentality. She did not feel their signage should be addressed the same as U.S. 41. She stated there were signage solutions other than large billboards and signs that have worked in other areas, such as Maine, that still help direct people to small businesses that are off the main roads. She also discussed helping small businesses stay in business by getting residents to frequent their services and spending money on the Island. She also felt encouraging overnight tourism during summer months would be helpful to businesses in the area. Ms. McLaughlin felt that protecting jobs, the local economy, and provided services, would keep residents from having to leave the island for their needs. She encouraged the Board to support this plan.

Ms. Sally Tapager, resident of Bokeelia and President of the Greater Pine Island Chamber of Commerce, stated her family ran a tourism business (boats) on Pine Island. Ms. Tapager stated that in Pine Island the residents enjoyed a country living surrounded by nature. She stated the residents wanted to preserve their land and peaceful way of life for as long as possible. She noted the Chamber of Commerce had 190 members, of which over 50% were involved in tourism. Although there is no great emphasis in the plan on tourism, Ms. Tapager stated that tourism is an important issue as it affects Pine Island's roads and businesses. She noted the Chamber of Commerce was not opposed to businesses, but is focusing on small family owned businesses as opposed to big businesses. She had concerns about signage, jet skis, air boats and parasailing, which she believed were incompatible to an environment like Pine Island. She encouraged the Board to approve the plan.

Mr. Inge asked if the Chamber of Commerce would be holding a meeting before the next Local Planning Agency. If so, he asked if Ms. Tapager could present a written position from the Chamber of Commerce to present before the Local Planning Agency at its April 22, 2002 meeting.

Ms. Tapager stated the Chamber of Commerce would have a meeting before the next Local Planning Agency and agreed to provide the LPA with a written position from the Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Kathy Malone, Council of Civic Association, read the following statement into the record:

"The Lee County Council of Civic Association (CCA) is an organization of 180 plus various entities including civic, environmental, elected officials, building and development interest and community leaders. The CCA Board of Directors at the Board's February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, voted unanimously to endorse the proposed Pine Island Community Plan and recommend to the Local Planning Agency that the plan

be transmitted to the County Commission for approval. As an 18 year resident of Matlacha, we also support the plan. The people that are here today are the people you will see at the next meeting. They are the people that really do care about their community and should have some say in its future.”

Mr. Brian Griffin, resident of Matlacha, noted there were almost 100 residents of Pine Island here earlier this morning. He stated several of them seemed to be under the impression that the Local Planning Agency were Commissioners or elected and paid officials. Mr. Griffin clarified that he was aware the Local Planning Agency were citizens who devoted their time which totalled about 30-40 hours a month in preparation for these meetings. He praised their current Commissioner for taking an interest in their area and attending their meetings. He encouraged the LPA to approve this plan in order to protect the Pine Island area. He noted that areas such as Estero and Bonita have been saturated with development, therefore, the development is now coming to Pine Island. Mr. Griffin emphasized that this whole process has been inclusive and continues to be well publicized

Ms. Judy Ott, resident of Pine Island, stated that the individuals involved in the Greater Pine Island plan were well informed, dedicated, conscientious and hardworking people. She stated that their efforts had saved the County a lot of money as well as staff time. She believed this proposed plan included well documented consideration of the main issues facing Pine Island residents as well as alternatives and specific actions Lee County can choose to take to assure that recommended actions are implemented. She reiterated statements made earlier that Pine Island is a unique community due to its 1) natural resources (mangroves, aquatic preserves), 2) historical resources, and 3) sense of community mindedness. Ms. Ott reviewed the items she believed were most important to the plan, such as: 1) initiating changes to the future land use maps and plan to create the new coastal rural category and reclassifying the rural lands on Pine Island (page 16 and 17), 2) initiating a schedule for eliminating conflicts between the outdated county/zoning classifications that conflict with current Lee Plan goals and policies (page 31), 3) initiating buffer strip requirements for new developments between cleared land and natural water bodies (page 35), and 4) to initiate a Lee County program to assess the condition of septic system drain fields along the salt water canals in St. James City, Bokeelia, and Flamingo Bay (page 37). She encouraged the LPA to approve the plan as presented.

Mr. Ralf Brooks, local land use attorney and employee of the Florida Wildlife Federation stated that he volunteered his time to assist with this proposed plan because he loved Pine Island, worked for the Florida Wildlife Federation, and because he was a sportsman. He noted that Pine Island Sound was the center of sportsmen activities for Lee County. He felt this feature drew people to the area. He discussed some legal issues with the Board involving clearing and restoring land, traffic capacity, hurricane evacuation, limiting rezonings, open space, and vested rights provisions or a minimum use procedure. He urged the LPA to approve the plan.

**d. CPA2000-35**

Mr. Chumley stated that the Lee County Regional Water Supply Authority was officially eliminated on June 30, 2001, but the Lee Plan still contains several references to the "Authority" as shown in the staff report. The Division of Utilities and Natural Resources for Lee County have now taken over most of the former responsibilities of the Water Supply Authority, therefore, staff is recommending language that reflects this change. Staff recommended transmittal of this amendment.

Ms. Brookman referred to Policy 16.4.1 and noted that although there were references to the Division of Natural Resources Director, there were no references to the Utilities Director. The language only states "Lee County Utilities Division."

Mr. Chumley thought the language was written this way because an actual approval is needed from the Director of Natural Resources. He did not believe the portion from Utilities required any formal approval.

Ms. Brookman referred to Policy 35.1.2 where it mentions "other local government agencies." She asked if this also included regional and state agencies that are responsible for water resource issues.

Mr. Chumley believed this would include any local or state agencies and agreed this language could be clarified.

Mr. Andress said he saw a presentation on television last week where the Utilities Director, Mr. Diaz, was stating that in 20 years Lee County would use up all the available water supply available in our aquifers and storage. Mr. Diaz mentioned that Lee County was starting to implement a program to do large scale desalinization of salt water. Mr. Andress requested that someone from the Utilities Division give a presentation on this to the Local Planning Agency.

**Mr. Stuart moved to find CPA2001-35 consistent with the Lee Plan, seconded by Ms. Brookman. There being no further discussion the motion passed 6-0.**

**Agenda Item 5 – Other Business** - None

**Agenda Item 6 – Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.