

Dear UCCA Member,

At this time the proposed Rum Road Collective (RRC) zoning change remains with insufficiencies before Lee County staff. When there are no more insufficiencies staff will recommend approval or disapproval of the proposed change to a Hearing Officer. We encourage UCCA members who oppose the RRC rezoning request to email the lead Lee County staff person, Adam Mendez (amendez@leegov.com) expressing your concerns.

1. Begin by giving your name, island address and approximate distance from the RRC properties.
2. Provide your reasons for opposition to the proposed RRC rezoning.

Your email should reflect your personal perspective.

Information you may consider in composing your email to Adam Mendez:

1. The first objective of the Lee Plan for North Captiva Island (leegov.com/dcd/Documents/Planning/LeePlan/LeePlan.pdf), section 26 reads:
“Objective 26:1: Future land use. Preserve the traditional character, scale and tranquility of the North Captiva Community by continuing to limit the densities and intensities of use and development to sustainable levels that will not adversely impact the natural environment and overburden the existing infrastructure.” We regard the Lee Plan as a promise to residents and guests alike to keep the island tranquil, respectful of nature, and a unique place to visit and live.

The applicant seeks to fundamentally change the character of the island by proposing to rezone approximately 1.15 acres at the center of the island from TFC-2 to Mixed-Use Planned Development to allow for a dwelling unit and 21,600 square feet of commercial uses. There are approximately 30 other lots on the island that are zoned for commercial development.

2. The RRC rezoning proposal is inconsistent with the Lee Plan for North Captiva island and does not make a case for overriding the Lee Plan. See 34-145(d) (4) Lee County Land Development Code. See also 163.3194(1), Florida Community Development Act providing the following: “(a) After a comprehensive plan, or element or portion thereof, has been adopted in conformity with this act all development undertaken by and all actions taken in regard to development orders by governmental agencies in regard to land covered by such plan or element shall be consistent with such plan or element as adopted...(and) all land development regulations enacted or amended shall be consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan or element or portion thereof...” (emphasis added).

3. The intent of the County staff review is to carefully consider potential adverse impacts on the community and encourage compatibility in the overall site design and scale of the project. “Compatible” is defined in section 34-2 of the Land Development Code to mean: “in describing the relation between two land uses, the state wherein those two things

exhibit either a positive relationship based on fit, similarity or reciprocity of circumstances, or a neutral relationship based on a relative lack of conflict (actual or potential) or on a failure to communicate negative or harmful influences on to another.” The RRC proposal is incompatible with the scale, intensity and character of the surrounding area. The proposed mixture of uses is not appropriate to the proposed location.

Rich Della Fera

Ron Glick

For the UCCA Government Relations Committee and the
UCCA Board