

**APPENDIX B: RURAL LAND-USE
ALTERNATIVES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR APPENDIX B

1. *Conservation land purchases* B - 1
 2. *Larger lots in rural areas* B - 1
 3. *Cluster development* B - 2
 4. *Transferable development rights* B - 3
 5. *Rate-of-growth control* B - 3
 6. *Dual-classification with clustering* B - 4
 7. *Conservation clustering with incentives* B - 5

This appendix contains an evaluation of five growth management techniques for Pine Island plus two hybrid techniques. Any of these techniques could become part of the new comprehensive plan and its future land use map and would be implemented through subsequent changes to other county regulations. (Existing lots would presumably be “grandfathered in” even if they are now vacant.)

1. Conservation land purchases

Local citizens have a strong interest in preserving portions of the native landscape. In 1996, Lee County voters initiated the Conservation 2020 program and funded it with a half-mill property tax for seven years. In the past year Lee County has begun negotiating the purchase of several large Pine Island tracts for preservation under this program. The state of Florida also has a major land acquisition program; in fact they were equal partners with Lee County in purchasing a 103-acre preserve near St. James City in 1993 that provides a nesting habitat for bald eagles. The federal government is also increasing its role in environmental land acquisitions in southwest Florida.

Through their combined efforts, these programs could purchase major portions of Pine Island’s upland habitats over the next ten years. At present, about 2,800 acres of undeveloped native upland habitat remains, excluding that found on fragmented subdivision parcels. Almost all of this habitat is located in Pine Island’s “Rural” areas. Removing any or all of these tracts from the private land market would make their treatment under the comprehensive plan moot. This update to the comprehensive plan could help these agencies identify the most valuable native lands remaining on Pine Island and demonstrate a consensus of Pine Islanders that such purchases would be welcomed.

The positive features of this approach would be taking advantage of existing governmental priorities on habitat preservation and, as a fortunate byproduct, helping maintain the character of the rural portions of Pine Island and precluding residential development. Extensive research on the physical characteristics of large tracts has been carried out recently by the non-profit Calusa Land Trust; their data could be used to help guide this effort. The effects on large landowners would be minimal because these acquisitions have historically been voluntary transactions with willing sellers.

Some negative features of this approach are the reliance on outside agencies that might decide to spend their acquisition funds outside Pine Island, or that might not complete their Pine Island purchases until such time as many natural habitats have been cleared for farming or have become overrun by invasive exotic vegetation.

2. Larger lots in rural areas

An obvious alternative to the current “Rural” category on Pine Island is to simply lower the allowable density for residential development, to either 1 DU/20 acres (or /10 or /5 acres). There is ample local precedent for density reductions; in 1990, Lee County created a new “Density Reduction – Groundwater Resource” category, where density is limited to 1 DU/10 acres,

and has applied it to about 74 square miles of land, mostly east of I-75 and south of SR 82 but also some land along the Charlotte County line near SR 31. Most of the remaining land within two miles of the Charlotte County line have been reduced to a density of 1 DU/5 acres.

In those cases the density reductions were made by the county to resolve a legal challenge by the state land planning agency against Lee County's comprehensive plan. Although much of the motive for the reduction was to prevent further urban sprawl, in those cases the lands were selected based on proximity to shallow underground water sources that can be contaminated by urban development. Land values did not plummet after the reduction, as many landowners had claimed they would. Values were maintained because there were other viable purchasers for this land, including fill-dirt and limerock mines; the citrus and tomato industries; government purchases of wildlife habitat and environmentally sensitive lands; and land speculators who anticipate fewer restrictions at some point in the future.

Although there are no comparable groundwater resource issues on Pine Island, there is an obvious public purpose to reducing densities that cannot be supported by adequate infrastructure (in Pine Island's case, limited road access to the mainland). This distinction could be reflected by naming this new land-use category "Coastal Rural."

Positive features of this density-reduction approach are its simplicity and the local experience with this obvious method of controlling urban development where it does not belong. This approach furthers the important planning objective of clearly separating urban and rural uses, as called for in the state comprehensive plan and the state's rules governing local comprehensive plans. This approach could result in subdividing rural land into, say, five-acre homesites, which would avoid agricultural clear-cutting (although it would still result in considerable clearing of native pines and palmettos for yard space).

A significant negative feature is that it would not interfere with further habitat destruction that occurs when undisturbed lands are converted completely to agriculture. Also, it might be seen as overly harsh by large landowners, who also might characterize it as an unfair attempt to lower their land values to benefit future conservation purchasers of large tracts.

3. Cluster development

Under current regulations, "Rural" lands are limited to 1 DU/acre, but there is no prohibition on requesting a rezoning that would allow the same number of dwelling units arranged differently, for instance with houses "clustered" on smaller lots surrounding a golf course. Such arrangements are voluntary on the part of the landowner and subject to approval through the formal rezoning process.

Clustering as currently practiced rarely preserves significant native habitats. In fact it is an inducement to develop the predominant Florida real estate form of the last two decades, country club communities surrounding golf courses, a development form that hardly matches the stated purpose of the "Rural" category.

The concept of clustering could, however, be modified to suit Pine Island conditions. For instance, clustering could be mandatory rather than voluntary, with fixed percentages of native habitats being retained within new developments. On very large tracts, houses might still be allowed around golf courses or fill-dirt lakes if the percentage of native habitat that must be retained was fairly low, such as 30%. Higher percentages, such as 70%, would preclude recreational facilities such as golf courses that consume large amounts of land, and thus could preserve more of the natural landscape.

The best feature of a modified clustering approach could be preservation of native habitats without outright purchase. Lee County's considerable experience with clustered development

and its flexible zoning categories can be used to accomplish this goal. Clustering is unlikely to trigger any claims under the Bert Harris Act, and would be prized by Pine Islanders (present and future) who place a high value on proximity to natural preserves.

Some negative features are that many tracts, especially those that have been farmed, have no native habitat remaining. Although habitat can be restored, restoration is more costly than preserving existing habitats. Also, protected habitats may end up being fragmented, which reduces their value to wildlife (compared to preservation purchases of entire large tracts).

4. Transferable development rights

The rights to develop a parcel of land can be permanently severed from that parcel and transferred to another parcel. This concept is called transferable development rights (TDR).

Lee County has had a TDR program for fifteen years. Wetlands are allowed only 1 DU/20 acres, but wetland owners who agree *never* to develop not only can transfer those development rights, but they actually get to multiply their density by a factor of four; they are allowed to sell the wetland development rights at a ratio of 1 DU/5 acres of wetlands. The development rights can be used at certain other locations in Lee County. The market value of these development rights is set by the private market; Lee County is not involved in the actual sale, only in approving the “receiving” locations, which are planned urban areas on the mainland.

Lee County’s first TDRs were created on Pine Island in the late 1980s. The undeveloped wetlands in the St. Jude Harbor subdivision were converted by the landowners into 436 TDR units. (In that single instance, the number of TDRs wasn’t based on acreage, but rather on the number of lots that the landowner had been trying to sell from that property.) However, to date the landowners have only been able to sell about a fourth of

these TDRs, at an average price of around \$3,000 each.

TDR programs tend to be popular with the public and with elected officials because of their inherent sense of fairness, and the seeming ability to avoid creating winners and losers in the land-use planning process. They are less popular with landowners, who often fear they will be unable to sell them. The reason is that TDRs are valuable to buyers only when development rights are a scarce commodity, typically when local governments have strict regulations on development. Lee County’s regulations have never been very strict; consequently, TDRs have had only very limited success locally. (Some governments offer to buy and stockpile TDRs at some fixed price to create a minimum value for TDRs.)

A new TDR program for Pine Island would need to identify receiving locations other than those currently in use; otherwise the new TDRs would further flood the same market as the current TDR program and therefore be unsaleable or saleable only at relatively low prices. TDRs would be quite valuable if they could be used to allow greater development on the barrier islands, but all of Lee County’s islands suffer the same transportation constraints as Pine Island. TDRs would also be valuable in the areas where Lee County has restricted density levels to 1 DU/10 acres, but again those restrictions were placed for a purpose and it would be difficult to justify swapping unwanted development rights to another unsuitable location.

5. Rate-of-growth control

Some communities establish a cap on the number of residential building permits that can be issued in each quarter or each year. A similar cap on commercial permits could be established so that commercial development does not outpace residential growth.

A side benefit of this approach in some communities is to allow a comparison of the quality of development applications and

approve only those that best comply with community standards. On Pine Island, objective criteria could be established to measure the cumulative impact on Pine Island's environment, on hurricane evacuation plans, on availability of utilities and supporting infrastructure, and on overall conformance with the goals of the comprehensive plan. Permits could be issued at the end of each quarter to the highest scoring applicants until the quota for that quarter, perhaps 25 dwelling units, has been met.

Rate-of-growth ordinances are usually established during periods of runaway growth to allow the government time to provide the needed roads and utilities.

The city of Sanibel adopted a rate-of-growth ordinance in the late 1970s. It was imposed through a citizen referendum during a period of very high growth shortly after the city's incorporation, with a limitation on building permits of 180 dwelling units per year. Every four months, all permit applications were compared, and up to 60 were issued. Preference was given to below-market-rate housing, single-family homes, and smaller condominium buildings. A "grading" scheme was used to reward quality development proposals, although this had only mixed results. The Sanibel ordinance was repealed when permit requests fell below the cap for several years in a row.

On a practical level, a positive feature of this approach for Pine Island is that it isn't really essential right now. Growth rates have been relatively slow during the past decade, so an annual cap that is suitable for the long term would probably be painless in the beginning, allowing refinement of the criteria before they result in rejection of applications.

Negative features are that this approach might be more difficult to defend in the absence of a runaway growth crisis and in the absence of specific infrastructure shortfalls that Lee County is in the process of correcting. Rate-of-growth ordinances are usually controversial and difficult to administer, and cause delays in the

processing of even routine building permits. They tend to spur speculative building and can discourage individual lot owners who wish to build a home for themselves. Perhaps the biggest negative is that, in the absence of the other approaches suggested above, an annual growth cap would lead Pine Island to the same place as the current system, with the arrival time merely delayed.

6. Dual-classification with clustering

These five techniques need not be applied in isolation. In fact, two hybrid solutions offer more promise than any single technique. The first hybrid, dual-classification with clustering, would create two new categories for the existing "Rural" lands:

- Disturbed lands, which have been farmed or otherwise cleared of native vegetation, or which have advanced infestation of exotic trees. On these lands, agriculture would be allowed and encouraged. Residential densities would be lowered to 1 DU/10 acres. Given the strong local evidence that lands suitable for agriculture are worth more than their development value, Bert Harris Act claims would be unlikely to succeed. A later increase in residential density could be provided for, if cleared lands were restored to native habitats through planting of native pines and palmettos; on tracts with hundreds of acres, such habitat restoration might be combined with a golf course, all built on previously disturbed lands.
- Undisturbed upland habitats, such as native slash pine and palmetto habitats. Agriculture and golf courses would be prohibited here. Residential density might stay at present levels, but new regulations would require development areas to be clustered to protect a high percentage, perhaps 70%, of natural upland habitats. Future conservation purchases would also be focused on these lands.

The positive features of this first hybrid approach are that it would encourage continued agricultural use on disturbed lands while diminishing the potential for residential development on those lands in the future. It would prohibit the destruction of undisturbed habitats where they still exist, while offsetting any resulting diminution of land value by maintaining current density levels there. Any actual development on undisturbed habitats would disturb far less land than would occur today by allowing today's number of dwelling units to be placed on smaller lots. Public purchases of entire tracts for preservation would still be highly desirable and encouraged, but if those purchases do not take place, this alternate plan would ensure far more preservation than current regulations.

Some negative features are the complexity of the classification process and the need to establish two new land-use categories in the comprehensive plan instead of one (or none). It will seem counterintuitive to many to allow higher densities on natural habitats than on disturbed lands (although this serves as an incentive *not* to clear native habitats). This approach might be seen as overly harsh by owners of large disturbed tracts whose expectations are for urban development rather than agriculture.

7. Conservation clustering with incentives

The second hybrid technique, conservation clustering with incentives, is similar to the first but would require only one new category for existing “Rural” lands. The new category would attempt to maintain most of the benefits of the first hybrid, but in this case using a sliding scale of density rewards to encourage (rather than *require*) conservation of undisturbed habitats.

For instance, a tract with undisturbed native habitats might maintain today's density of 1 DU/acre density if 70% of the undisturbed uplands were preserved. Those dwelling units would be placed on the remaining 30% of the land, which would be possible by using lots that are smaller than today's

one-acre standard. (Table B-1 shows that the resulting developed area, including its streets and stormwater detention areas, would use about 0.3 acres per lot, similar to many existing single-family neighborhoods on Pine Island.) If *less than 70%* of the uplands were preserved, the allowable density would decrease, as shown in the table. If no undisturbed uplands were preserved, the residential density would drop to 1 DU/10 acres.

TABLE B-1

Assume % of native land saved or restored	Would then be assigned this gross density:	RESULTS ON 100 ACRES WOULD BE:			
		# of DUs	acres used per lot	total acres preserved	total acres used
0%	1 DU per 10 acres	10	10.0 acres	0	100
5%	1 DU per 9 acres	11	8.6 acres	5	95
10%	1 DU per 8 acres	13	7.2 acres	10	90
15%	1 DU per 7 acres	14	6.0 acres	15	85
20%	1 DU per 6 acres	17	4.8 acres	20	80
30%	1 DU per 5 acres	20	3.5 acres	30	70
40%	1 DU per 4 acres	25	2.4 acres	40	60
50%	1 DU per 3 acres	33	1.5 acres	50	50
60%	1 DU per 2 acres	50	0.8 acres	60	40
70%	1 DU per 1 acre	100	0.3 acres	70	30

Table B-2 shows another variation which would require preservation of 85% of native lands in order to maintain today's density of 1 DU/acre. Under this scenario, the resulting developed areas would be limited to the remaining 15% of the land, whose developed area, including its streets and stormwater detention areas, would use about 0.15 acres per dwelling unit. At this density, the dwelling units might be in the form of townhouses or garden apartments.

TABLE B-2

Assume % of native land saved or restored	Would then be assigned this gross density:	RESULTS ON 100 ACRES WOULD BE:			
		# of DUs	acres used per lot	total acres preserved	total acres used
0%	1 DU per 10 acres	10	10.00 acres	0	100
5%	1 DU per 9 acres	11	8.55 acres	5	95
15%	1 DU per 8 acres	13	6.80 acres	15	85
25%	1 DU per 7 acres	14	5.25 acres	25	75
35%	1 DU per 6 acres	17	3.90 acres	35	65
45%	1 DU per 5 acres	20	2.75 acres	45	55
55%	1 DU per 4 acres	25	1.80 acres	55	45
65%	1 DU per 3 acres	33	1.05 acres	65	35
75%	1 DU per 2 acres	50	0.50 acres	75	25
85%	1 DU per 1 acre	100	0.15 acres	85	15

This technique would also allow credits for restoration of native habitats on previously disturbed lands. The same benefits would be granted to restored land as to preserved land, using the same sliding scale.

The positive features of conservation clustering with incentives are that it diminishes the potential for residential development on agricultural land, while rewarding landowners who protect (or restore) their land's natural habitats. As with the first hybrid, actual development on undisturbed habitats would disturb far less land than would occur today by either allowing today's number of dwelling units to be placed on smaller lots, or by reducing the number of lots that are allowable. Public purchases of entire tracts for preservation would still be desirable, but regardless, this plan would encourage more preservation than current regulations.

As with the dual-classification hybrid, it will seem counter-intuitive to many to allow higher densities on natural habitats than on disturbed lands (although this serves as an incentive *not* to clear native habitats). This approach might be seen as overly harsh by owners of large disturbed tracts whose expectations are for urban development rather than agriculture. Also, since clearing of native habitats would not be prohibited, if landowners don't find the density rewards to be sufficiently valuable, the result might be the loss of remaining undisturbed lands on Pine Island.