Rural Lifestyle development is rearing its ugly head in Martin County next week when the Local Planning Agency will consider the Ranch PUD Zoning Agreement, Master Site Plan and Phasing Plan. The only item on the LPA agenda for the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Thursday, April 18, is the Ranch PUD, formerly known as Calusa Creek Ranch.

The Staff Report is extremely lacking, however, if not actively misleading. (See attached)

The staff report identifies the property as 3,460 acres on the south side of SW Kanner Highway and 442 acres on the north side of Kanner Highway (adjacent to the C-44 Canal) with a Future Land Use designation of Agricultural and a zoning category of A-2 Agricultural.

Staff says the property has a pending Comprehensive Plan amendment for future land use change and text amendment "to enable the PUD, clustering of residential units and extension of water and wastewater service to the property", which is outside the Urban Services Boundary.

But staff does not identify the pending land use change and text amendment, concealing the fact that the property was the subject of a highly controversial proposed Comp Plan amendment to change the land use to Rural Lifestyle and that it is more than a mile outside the USB.

Rural Lifestyle is not even mentioned in the 15-page staff report (except to designate the land use on another parcel on Bridge Road that was previously approved for Rural Lifestyle use).

Incredibly, the staff finds the application "in compliance with the applicable land development regulations." Even more incredibly, while the applicant seeks approval of a PUD Zoning Agreement, no PUD Zoning Agreement is contained within the agenda package available for public review, making it impossible to determine the terms of the proposed agreement which LPA members are being asked to approve.

Not so incredibly, the Disclosure of Interest Affidavit which is supposed to disclose all "natural persons" and entities with any interest in the property names five limited liability companies and just one "natural person" (Kenneth S. Bakst) as owners, making it impossible to determine whether any staff members, Commissioners, administrative officers, or other individuals associated with the government approval process have any interest in the subject property.

The staff report says the PUD and Master Site Plan applications are contingent on final approval of the unidentified Comp Plan text and Future Land Use Map Amendments (apparently referring to the Rural Lifestyle amendments). But the project narrative submitted by the applicant says the property is designated with the Agricultural Future Land Use and is zoned A-2 Agricultural and "the applicant is not proposing any change to the Future Land Use designation, maximum residential density, or urban service boundaries."

Has Calusa Creek Ranch abandoned its application to change the land use designation to Rural Lifestyle?

Staff makes no reference to the South Florida Water Management District's scathing review of the proposed Future Land Use Map Amendment to change the land use designation to Rural Lifestyle.

The agenda packet is confusing, incomplete, and apparently designed to avoid citizen participation in the process.

Ginny Sherlock LITTMAN, SHERLOCK & HEIMS, P.A. P.O. Box 1197 Stuart, FL 34995 Telephone: (772) 287-0200

Telephone: (772) 287-0200 Facsimile: (772) 872-5152

www.lshlaw.net

