



Fort Myers Beach Local Planning Agency

**Town Hall Council Chambers
2731 Oak Street
Fort Myers Beach, FL 33931**

Minutes

Tuesday, April 8, 2025

9:00 AM

ORDER OF BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER

Members present: Chair Cereceda, LPA Member Boan, LPA Member Dunlap, LPA Member Eckmann, LPA Member McLean and LPA Member Plummer.

Excused: LPA Member Sudduth

LPA Member Dunlap moved to accept LPA Member Sudduth's absence, seconded by LPA Member Boan.

The motion carried unanimously.

II. INVOCATION

Chair Cereceda.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA

LPA Member Boan moved to approve the final agenda, seconded by LPA Member Plummer.

The motion carried unanimously.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Local Planning Agency - March 11, 2025

LPA Member McLean moved to approve the minutes, seconded by LPA Member Plummer.

The motion carried unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Cereceda addressed the controversy surrounding her donation to ProtectFMB.

Town Attorney Stuparich stated that her comments to Chair Cereceda regarding the donation were the same words she used at yesterday's town council meeting. Paula Kiker, resident, expressed her opinion about Chair Cereceda donating to ProtectFMB. She explained why she felt the town attorney was wrong.

Ed Rood, resident, appreciated Chair Cereceda's explanation but expressed his

opinion about her bias. He said he knew that she was going to vote against the projects on the agenda today. He added that she should have kept her contribution anonymous.

Karen Woodson, resident, stated that ProtectFMB was reprehensible and the town council had concerns about optics. She expressed her opinion and did not think Chair Cereceda was supporting the current council or the LPA.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Town Attorney Stuparich explained the quasi-judicial procedures and the expedited variance process. Town Clerk Baker confirmed that all agenda items were properly advertised and noticed. She swore in those providing testimony.

A. REZ20240275; 1011 Third Street

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA APPROVING/ APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS/ DENYING A REZONING OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1011 THIRD STREET, FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA (STRAP NUMBER 24-46-23-W3-00202.0060) FROM DOWNTOWN TO RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (RPD) WITH THREE DEVIATIONS: 1) REQUEST TO APPLY PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS FOR THE DOWNTOWN ZONING DISTRICT, RATHER THAN THE RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY STANDARDS IN SEC. 34-943 REQUIRING USE OF THE RM DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, 2) REDUCTION OF THE REQUIRED 5-FOOT SIDE YARD SETBACKS TO ALLOW FOR DEVELOPMENT ON THE EASTERN PROPERTY LINE and 3) REQUESTING A FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) OF 1.7, AN INCREASE OVER THE 1.0 FAR ALLOWED IN SEC. 34-675(C)(3); PROVIDING FOR CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Chair Cereceda read the title of the ordinance. Ex parte communications: LPA Member Plummer noted she walked by the property and Chair Cereceda spoke to Matt Noble. She talked to the owner long ago about a project without specifics. No disclosures from other members. The applicant confirmed receipt of the agenda and background materials.

Matt Noble reviewed his qualifications as a planner.

LPA Member Eckmann moved to accept Mr. Noble as an expert in his field, seconded by LPA Member Plummer.

The motion carried unanimously.

Community Development Senior Planner Jason Smalley reviewed the background of the request as stated on the yellow sheet and described the three deviations. The staff recommended approval because it was a reduction in density.

Mr. Noble utilized PowerPoint for his presentation. Slides included the previous building, Three Deviations, Schedule of Uses, Property Development Regulations, Subject Site Location, Survey, LeePa 2021 Image, 2021 Pictometry, LeePa 2024 Image, LeePa 4 Unit Appraisal Details, Appraisal Floors 1 & 2, Master Concept Plan, Proposed Building and Public

Benefits.

No public comment.

LPA Member Dunlap moved to approve the ordinance, seconded by LPA Member McLean.

The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

B. VAR20250027; 726 Estero Boulevard

726 ESTERO BOULEVARD: A RESOLUTION OF THE FORT MYERS BEACH LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS VARIANCE 20250027, REQUESTING THREE VARIANCES FROM LDC TABLE 34-3 FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 726 ESTERO BOULEVARD., GENERALLY REFERED TO AS STRAP NUMBER 24-46-23-W3-00400.007B IN FORT MYERS BEACH, TO VARY FROM REQUIRED STREET SETBACK, REAR SETBACK, AND BUILDING COVERAGE TO BUILD A NEW SINGLE FAMILY STRUCTURE IN THE RM ZONING DISTRICT; AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Chair Cereceda read the title of the resolution. No ex parte disclosures. Community Development Planner Eli Lee reviewed the background of the request and the three variances as stated on the yellow sheet. The staff recommended approval with conditions.

Planner Jim Ink distributed his presentation. Slides included Team Members, What this Request Would do and Why Grant the Request, Request Statement, Presentation Outline, Location, Pre-lan Survey, Post-lan Survey, Design, Floor Plan, Elevations, Request Statement, Variance 1 - Front Setback, Variance 2 - Rear Setback, Variance 3 - Lot Coverage, Variances 1-3 Findings and Conclusions, What this Request Would do and Why Grant the Request and Suggested Motion.

Planner Lee reviewed the conditions in the staff report.

No public comment.

LPA Member Boan moved to approve the resolution with three variances and five conditions, seconded by LPA Member McLean.

The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

C. VAR20250048; 1901 Estero

A RESOLUTION OF THE FORT MYERS BEACH LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY APPROVING/APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS/DENYING VARIANCE APPLICATION 20250027 FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1901 ESTERO BLVD., FORT MYERS BEACH (STRAP NUMBER 19-46-24-W4-0090B.0080) FOR THE FOLLOWING 5 VARIANCES: 1) A VARIANCE OF 15 FEET TO ALLOW A FRONT SETBACK OF 25 FEET WHERE 5-10 FEET IS REQUIRED; 2) A VARIANCE OF 5 FEET TO ALLOW A REAR SETBACK OF 20 FEET WHERE 25 FEET IS REQUIRED; 3) A VARIANCE TO BUFFER REQUIREMENTS TO PROPOSE A BETTERMENT PLAN

WITHOUT A BOUNDARY WALL; 4) A VARIANCE TO PARKING LOCATION REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW BACK-OUT PARKING ALONG ESTERO BLVD. AND OHIO AVENUE; AND 5) A VARIANCE TO PARKING AMOUNT REQUIREMENTS FROM 22 REQUIRED PARKING SPACES TO 9 SPACES, FOR A PROPOSED MIXED-USE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING RETAIL AND RESTAURANT USES; PROVIDING FOR OTHER CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Chair Cereceda read the title of the resolution. Ex parte communications: LPA Members Boan and McLean disclosed receiving emails from Mr. Lee and Chair Cereceda talked to someone regarding the denial. No disclosures from other members.

Community Development Principal Planner Judith Frankel reviewed the background of the request as stated on the yellow sheet. She described the five variances and the conditions. Staff recommended denial due to back-out parking on Estero and reduced parking spaces; however, staff believed that the project was consistent with the comprehensive plan. She noted that the applicant would address the situation with the neighbor's fence in his presentation.

Planner Jim Ink distributed his presentation. Slides included Team Members, What this Request Would do and Why Grant the Request, Request Statement, Presentation Outline, South Downtown, Pre-lan Survey, Post-lan Survey, Design, LDC Site Plan, Proposed Site Plan, Elevations, Proposed Site Plan, Request Statement, Variance 1 - Front Setback, Variance 2 - Rear Setback and Variance 3 - Rear Buffer. Planner Ink stated that a new six-foot vinyl fence would be built on their side of the neighbor's damaged fence and behind it would be an upgrade to a Type F planting. He addressed the back-out parking in Variance 4 and noted several locations on the island. He supported converting the parking on Estero to golf carts and bicycles. ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) parking could be located on the Ohio side of the building. He continued with Variance 5 - Parking Reduction, Findings and Conclusions concerning the Variances, What this Request Would do and Why Grant the Request and Suggested Motion. Planner Ink noted they would build it as soon as they could.

Public comment:

David Leigh, resident, supported the project with conditions. He wanted clarification regarding how the water runoff will be handled because the footpath becomes a river when it rains. He explained why the six-foot vinyl fence had to be CMU-reinforced. He preferred to keep the nine spaces in front because parking had not been an issue since the traffic was so slow. He wanted non-debris landscaping to keep leaves out of his pool and enhance his view on the first floor.

Public comment closed.

Principal Planner Frankel clarified that the parking spaces on Ohio did not belong to the site, but the town council was amenable to a lease agreement.

She reviewed the recommended conditions and asked that the landscaping comply with the line of sight requirements, especially at the corner of Ohio and Estero.

Planner Ink thought a sentence in the code prohibits parking in front of a building. They agreed to plant Foxtail palms. Principal Planner Frankel confirmed that the sentence regarding parking existed. After reviewing the code, Section 34-3241(c) states that a variance is not needed regarding existing parking spaces in front of the existing non-conforming structure.

Since alterations were not being made to the existing spaces, it does not violate Division Three of Article Five of Chapter 34. Principal Planner Frankel will add a finding to the resolution.

LPA Member McLean moved to approve the resolution with the five variances, including staff conditions and buffering will be Florida-friendly plants including Foxtail palms, the facilities on the north side of the building will be used for maintenance and emergency egress only, landscaping will conform to line of sight requirement and include a whereas clause recognizing that parking is allowed in front of the building, seconded by LPA Member Dunlap.

The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

D. VAR20250056, 2900/2902 Estero Blvd

A RESOLUTION OF THE FORT MYERS BEACH LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS VARIANCE 20250056, REQUESTING FOUR VARIANCES FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2900/2902 ESTERO BLVD., IN THE RM ZONING DISTRICT, AND GENERALLY REFERED TO AS STRAP NUMBER 30-46-24-W2-003M0.0140 IN FORT MYERS BEACH, 1) A VARIANCE OF 5 FEET FROM REQUIRED 25-FOOT STREET SETBACK, IN DIVISION 4. TABLE 34-3, FROM ESTERO BLVD., TO ALLOW A PRIMARY STRUCTURE 20 FEET FROM ESTERO BLVD., 2) A VARIANCE OF 10 FEET FROM THE REQUIRED 25-FOOT STREET SETBACK, IN DIVISION 4. TABLE 34-3, FROM SEAVIEW ST., TO ALLOW A PRIMARY STRUCTURE 15 FEET FROM SEAVIEW ST. 3) A VARIANCE OF 15 FEET FROM THE REQUIRED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE STREET SETBACK, IN DIVISION 4. TABLE 34-3, TO ALLOW AN AT-GRADE POOL WITHOUT SCREEN ENCLOSURE 10 FEET FROM SEAVIEW ST., 4) A VARIANCE FROM SEC. 34-1174(b) TO ALLOW A POOL CLOSER TO THE STREET THAN THE PRIMARY STRUCTURE; AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Chair Cereceda read the title of the resolution. No ex parte communications were disclosed.

Community Development Planner Sarah Propst reviewed the background of the request as stated on the yellow sheet. The staff recommended approval with conditions.

LPA Member Plummer was concerned about the lack of a walkway around

two sides of the pool.

Kara Stewart represented the applicant. She was unaware of anything in the code regarding the pool, but the architect was checking. She explained that the lot was small, so there were not many options for the pool. The home will be elevated to comply with flood regulations.

No public comment.

Ms. Stewart indicated there was no requirement for a walkway around the pool.

LPA Member Boan moved to approve the resolution, the four variances and staff conditions, seconded by LPA Member Plummer.

The motion carried unanimously.

E. Arches Resort CPD

ARCHES COMMERCIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT: AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA APPROVING/APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS/DENYING THE COMMERCIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (CPD) ZONING FOR THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 450, 445, 441 & 436 HARBOR COURT, 435 & 438 BONITA STREET, 935, & 939 THIRD STREET, AND 401 OLD SAN CARLOS BLVD., ALSO RESPECTIVELY IDENTIFIED AS STRAP NUMBERS 24-46-23-W3-00027.0000 & 24-46-23-W3-00026.0020, 24-46-23-W3-0030B.0200, 24-46-23-W3-0030B.0190, 24-46-23-W3-0030C.0060, 24-46-23-W3-0030C.0040, 24-46-23-W3-0030A.0110, 24-46-23-W3-0030A.0030, 24-46-23-W3-0030A.0020 & 24-46-23-W3-0030A.0010 FORT MYERS BEACH; PROVIDING FOR CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Town Attorney Stuparich explained the quasi-judicial procedures. Town Clerk Baker confirmed that all agenda items were properly advertised and noticed. She swore in those providing testimony. Chair Cereceda read the title of the ordinance. Ex parte communications: LPA Members McLean and Boan are familiar with the property, spoke to the applicant, watched a presentation by the Neighborhood Company and received multiple emails for and against the project, LPA Member Plummer saw the presentation and talked to neighbors, LPA Members Eckmann and Dunlap met with Ken, Patrick and the owner, reviewed the project and read numerous emails pro and con and Chair Cereceda met with the Neighborhood Company and Mr. Freeland for a presentation, received emails pro and con, have had many conversations including with one of the neighbors, Bill Spikowski and Tom Torgerson.

Attorney Megan Strayhorn from Strayhorn, Persons-Mulicka and Fisher represented the applicant. She asked that Chair Cereceda clarify her donation to ProtectFMB. Chair Cereceda replied that it had nothing to do with this project and she was not a member of the group. It had no bearing on her ability to be impartial.

Approved experts include Patrick Vanasse, Ken Gallander, Judith Frankel

and Sarah Propst. The applicant confirmed receipt of the agenda and background materials.

Principal Planner Frankel stated they would hear two requests; the first was a planned commercial development. She reviewed the background of the request as stated on the yellow sheet. She noted that the applicant would cover everything in their presentation, but she highlighted some items. The project included 263 lodging units with an equivalency factor of 9.1, they requested a FAR (Floor Area Ratio) of 2.5 and the proposed project requested buildings that will vary between one and seven stories with a maximum zoned height of 81 feet measured from base flood and a total height of 102 feet measured from grade. All the information is in the agenda packet. She reviewed the eight deviations. The staff recommended denial because they had concerns regarding the impact on neighboring communities and did not know the full impact of the various requested uses. A discussion was held regarding a separate agreement for a water ferry with the town, specific to that property owner, and would not run with the land.

The attorneys would determine what that agreement would look like and include it in the conditions.

Attorney Strayhorn stated they would work with the town attorney to identify the public benefits. She requested that the presentation, public comments and the information from last year be entered into the record.

Planner Vanasse with the Neighborhood Company utilized PowerPoint for his presentation. Slides included a photo of the marina pre-plan, the properties included in the CPD, Existing and Proposed Future Land Use Map, Key Points, Core Area Vision - pages 3-5, Community Design Element, The Arches Bayfront Resort renderings from 2024, Illustrative Master Plan, Views of the Reimagined Arches Resort, a Bodega, a Market with a pick-up/drop-off facility behind it, the Hotel with parking underneath, the Linear Park and Memorial Garden, the Promenade, the Water Taxi/Ferry Terminal, another view of the Promenade with the Clock Tower, Upper Deck with the Chapel, Building E, Aerial View from 3rd St., View at Grade from Harbor, View from the Bridge, North and South Concept Elevations - Maximum Height, Vehicular Network Plan, Pedestrian Network Plan, Public Access Plan, View Corridors/Sheds, Regulating Plan - Height Diagram, Linear Park Memorial Garden & Buffer Typical Sections, Master Concept Plan, Before & After Snapshot, Parking, Sec. 34-676 Circulation and Parking, Consistency with Comprehensive Plan, Compliance with LDC and CPD Criteria, Location, Site Design & Compatibility, Density/Intensity, Transportation, Traffic Mitigation, Public Benefits/Special Benefits, Proposed Conditions/Commitments, COP, Hours of Operation & Amplified Sound, Other, Deviations & Justifications, Economic Impacts, Annual & One Time Revenue, Hotel Room Update, Staff Report and Findings & Conclusion.

Public comment:

Chris Smuts, London Bay Development Group and others, discussed the economic impact on the beach. He felt the project was well-balanced and may be a premier destination. He described the benefits of the project.

Linda Miller runs the Farmer's Markets and likes the project because it replaces the industrial boat barns and it was beautiful. She felt it would reduce traffic and it reminded her of Key West. She noted it was a pedestrian-friendly project and would boost the economy.

Chris Mosteiro, resident, stated that the revised plan was not better. He noted that they stopped using the gate and now traffic came through his neighborhood. The linear park was laughable and would become a pedestrian walkway in his backyard. He would support a taller building closer to downtown, away from their houses. He said it was still too big in that location and requested a denial.

Robin Atwood, resident, had not been contacted by the applicant. She was concerned about the traffic coming off the island and the amount of traffic on Old San Carlos, which was full of pedestrians. Her view was currently of the marina, but this project will have people looking into their homes. A bar equals a party, especially when people are on vacation. There was no buffer between them and her neighborhood. She asked that they deny it, even though it was beautiful. If she wanted to live downtown, they would have bought downtown.

Jay Bonama, resident, agreed with Ms. Atwood and did not want to go through the same thing as the Rude Shrimp situation. The canal carried sound and they would hear the noise. The marina was quiet now and she felt it benefited the town because it serviced boats. She asked that they deny the request. Building E would tower over their house and should face the bay, not the canal.

Dale Bonama, resident, noted that Moss Marina had consumed approximately 10 single-family residential lots, with two more right on the canal. He was facing an 80-foot building. The core area was Times Square and Old San Carlos and should not intrude into neighborhoods. Property values would decline, but everyone else would make money. Balconies and bars would create noise and he would not see the sun until the afternoon.

Leah Greg, resident, purchased her home because it is in a residential neighborhood with a zoned marina close by, with no commercial properties anywhere. She thanked the applicant for scaling down the project but was unhappy about the blanket email from a marketing firm last year. She asked them to be honest and not mislead the public. She noted that Bonita Street was short and basically a dead-end street.

Terry Persaud, resident, stated the project was beautiful and much needed. Larger-scale projects will support the smaller projects and bring people downtown. He felt it was a great catalyst.

Janet Garza of Lee County and a beachgoer expressed gratitude to the Freelanders. She thought they listened to the community and adjusted their project. She feared development would slow down and noted that change was hard for some. She appreciated consideration to approve the project. Dennis Wagaman, realtor, supported the project because it represents an opportunity for the town to rise up after Ian. He appreciated the detail in the presentation. He felt it would limit the amount of traffic with the water taxis,

which was wonderful. He asked that they approve the project.

Nick Roland, owner of Snug Harbor, noted there was intensity and density on that property before. The reduction was the right move and asked them to consider moving the project forward.

Public comment closed.

Principal Planner Frankel addressed parking in deviation 8 and noted that the project would require a deviation even if they asked for a 33% reduction. She suggested that the 33% reduction would be the appropriate reduction to ask for, not 50%. She did not recommend denial based on the parking. She clarified logistics regarding the three zoning districts and compatibility with the neighborhood. Her denial was based on the impact on the neighborhoods. Principal Planner Frankel noted that elements of the project went along with the comp plan, but the riverside portion intruded on the single-family neighborhood. The transportation impact study was sent to an independent reviewer and he generally felt the conclusions were correct. She commented on the stabilized area on the Master Concept Plan. Principal Planner Frankel read the findings and conclusions, along with recommended conditions of approval, if the project is approved. She agreed that with the condition of approval of the comprehensive plan, the approval would be consistent with the comp plan as amended.

Town Attorney Stuparich suggested that a possible condition include an agreement for benefits and commitments that are not otherwise reflected in the site plan or the conditions.

LPA Member McLean asked if Mr. Freeland was open to modifying the hours and type of amplified music on the sunset deck. Mr. Freeland replied that he would come back with a plan at the council meeting. Chair Cereceda said there should only be ambient music on the sunset deck, there has to be buffering between the Matanzas' houses and the last building and Building E should only have ambient music and no outdoor COP. Mr. Freeland agreed. After a discussion, only ambient music on the sunset deck of Building B will be allowed from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. No bar at Building E and ambient music only from 7:00 a.m. to one hour after sunset. Planner Vanasse stated they would come back with enhanced plantings along Building E.

LPA Member Eckmann moved to recommend approval of the CPD with conditions that a small comprehensive plan amendment gets approved, acceptance of all of the staff's recommended conditions of approval including the ones just discussed that Principal Planner Frankel added to her list and that they just discussed as a group and a condition that they memorialize the agreements of additional public benefits that are not on the site plan with some form of document to be attached to the agreement, seconded by LPA Member Dunlap.

The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

- F. Comprehensive Plan Amendment- Marina and Mixed Residential FLU to Pedestrian Commercial FLU

ARCHES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT: AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA AMENDING THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH ADOPTED FUTURE LAND USE MAP DATED JANUARY 1, 1999, FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 450, 445, 441 & 436 HARBOR COURT, 435 & 438 BONITA STREET ALSO RESPECTIVELY IDENTIFIED AS STRAP NUMBERS 24-46-23-W3-00027.0000 & 24-46-23-W3-00026.0020, 24-46-23-W3-0030B.0200, 24-46-23-W3-0030B.0190, 24-46-23-W3-0030C.0060, 24-46-23-W3-0030C.0040 & 24-46-23-W3-0030A.0110, FORT MYERS BEACH; PROVIDING FOR CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Chair Cereceda read the title of the ordinance. Principal Planner Frankel reviewed the background of the request as stated on the yellow sheet. She noted that this is a map change only. She read the findings and conclusions. Staff recommended denial, but if the LPA finds the concurrent CPD application adequately demonstrates that the proposed development is "clearly in the public interest, not just in the private interest of a petitioning landowner," approval could be granted.

Attorney Strayhorn requested that items be entered into the record. She asked that the amendment be approved and the presentation be entered into the record. Planner Vanasse reviewed the findings and conclusions and requested recommended approval.

Public comment:

Dale Bonama, resident, stated that he was disappointed and did not understand why The Arches would be approved after the Margaritaville battle, which was not as tall and a commercial property. He mentioned that he would potentially lose 30% of his property value and should not be restricted to the 30-day rental. He felt they should be allowed to rent weekly to give them some relief from the changing neighborhood dynamics.

Chris Mosteiro, resident, stated this was a big project and they should offer more public benefits. He asked the applicant to consider more public benefits and discussed how his neighborhood flooded. He noted they could mitigate the floods.

Leah Greg, resident, suggested that the turnaround be safer for emergency vehicles and asked them to soundproof the garages so the neighborhood did not have to hear the backup beeps. She brought up the infrastructure and requested proper water management with adequate drainage.

Public comment closed.

LPA Member Eckmann moved to recommend approval of the ordinance because they did find that the concurrent CPD was in the public interest, seconded by LPA Member Dunlap.

The motion carried unanimously.

VIII. RECESS AS LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY / CONVENE AS HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD TO APPROVE MINUTES**A. Historic Preservation Board - October 22, 2024**

LPA Member Dunlap moved to approve the minutes, seconded by LPA Member Boan.

The motion carried unanimously.

LPA Member Sudduth was excused and the LPA accepted his excused absence.

IX. ADJOURN AS HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD / RECONVENE AS LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY**X. LPA MEMBERS ITEMS/REPORTS**

LPA Member Eckmann stated that he never felt that Chair Cereceda was biased in any of her judgments and he thanked her for her insightful and heartfelt comments.

LPA Member Plummer dittoed LPA Member Eckmann's comments.

No items from other members.

XI. LPA ATTORNEY ITEMS/REPORTS

Town Attorney Stuparich noted some of the titles would be more descriptive and they would start attaching various criteria to the ordinances.

XII. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ITEMS/REPORTS

No items.

XIII. ITEMS FOR NEXT MONTHS AGENDA

No items.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

LPA Member Dunlap moved to adjourn, seconded by LPA Member Eckmann. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

Minutes adopted as presented, April 29, 2025. Motion by LPA Member McLean and seconded by LPA Member Plummer. Passed 7-0.



Amy Baker (May 1, 2025 16:14 EDT)

Amy Baker, Town Clerk