



Fort Myers Beach Local Planning Agency

**Town Hall Council Chambers
6231 Estero Boulevard
Fort Myers Beach, FL 33931**

Minutes**Tuesday, April 14, 2026****9:00 AM**

ORDER OF BUSINESS

FINAL

I. CALL TO ORDER

Members present: Chair Anita Cereceda, LPA Members James Boan, Douglas Eckmann, James Dunlap, Jane Plummer, Don Sudduth, and Ed Schoonover. Chair Cereceda welcomed Ed Schoonover as the newest member of the Local Planning Agency.

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA

Mr. Dunlap moved to approve the final agenda, seconded by Ms. Plummer. The motion carried unanimously.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Tom Brady, President of Protect FMB and a full-time resident, is thankful for the Local Planning Agency and the quasi-judicial process. He believes that the financial discussions should revolve around work with the Town Manager and Finance Director.

Ellie Bunting provided a brief history of the development and incorporation of the town. She reminded the body that smart planning is their responsibility. She expressed her belief that enough expansion had already occurred.

Terry Cain reminded the Local Planning Agency that they must use the comprehensive plan. She stated that all decisions made today must be done for the greater good of the community. She requested that the issues brought forth be reviewed based on their merits only. She believed that this proposal is an example of land abuse on a tiny parcel of land, with its twelve requests for deviations and special exceptions in an environmentally critical zone.

She asserted that the height should not be approved. Ms. Cain provided her concerns about the limited parking and believes that the development would impact the entire island. She thanked the Local Planning Agency for their time and work.

VII. OVERVIEW OF OUTRIGGER RESORT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT (AKA LONDON BAY) PRESENTED BY 6200 ESTERO BLVD INVESTMENTS, LLC

Richard Yovanovich, Esq., on behalf of the applicant, requested to present the planned development and the comprehensive plan amendment at the same time. He understands that those items would be considered by the agency separately but wishes to provide a full picture of the request and save time.

Town Attorney Stuparich stated that she had been in discussion with Mr. Yovanovich about providing the applicant with the opportunity to introduce themselves to the community and highlight the differences between legislative and quasi-judicial proceedings. Mr. Yovanovich noted that he would like to provide a brief overview of the five different petitions, then follow with the London Bay story and their plan. Chair Cereceda asked if he wished to speak on the text amendment and future land use amendment in concert with the commercial planned development, before the agency votes on these items individually. She confirmed with him that part of his presentation would be about London Bay as a company and their participation in the community. She then requested that he reserve this portion for his presentation. There were no objections from the Local Planning Agency.

VIII. FMB LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

A. LPA Policies and Procedures, Adopted January 2025

Chair Cereceda called upon Town Attorney Stuparich, who summarized the different procedures for both quasi-judicial and legislative proceedings. She also confirmed with the Town Attorney that they would be able to swear in all witnesses for testimony on any issue for this meeting, including public comment.

Numerous witnesses were sworn in. There was an announcement from the Chair that additional members could be sworn in later, should they choose to participate.

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Ordinance 26-04: CPA20240067, 6200 Estero Blvd, Outrigger Resort Mixed-use: CPA-Text

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT (LEGISLATIVE)

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA AMENDING THE TEXT IN THE FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT, IN THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN-2045 ADOPTED DECEMBER 1, 2025, TO INCLUDE OUTRIGGER RESORT MIXED-USE LAND USE CATEGORY; PROVIDING FOR CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S

ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Cereceda read the title of the ordinance. Town Attorney Stuparich, in response to the Chair's point for clarification, noted that for the future map amendment item, they can incorporate by reference what was said during the presentation. The Chair provided that the agency will vote and consider each item separately. There was general consent from the body.

Mr. Green reported that the comprehensive plan consists of goals, objectives, and policies. In this document, there are multiple categories of mixed use.

This application and text amendment intends to make a new district for the described property that would fall under the mixed use heading. This proposal is site-specific.

Copies of the presentation and letters of support were distributed to the Local Planning Agency. Town Attorney Stuparich also requested that an electronic copy be projected so that members of the public can see these documents.

Mr. Yovanovich began with an introduction of the project team. He presented a summary of the applicant's requests and presented maps to illustrate various aspects of the proposal. His presentation also featured key changes since 2024. Mark Wilson, founder of London Bay, presented on the company's history and properties in Southwest Florida; its local focus and expertise in development; its core values; and its positive economic impact on the community. He provided photographs of the various projects they worked on. He then gave an overview of the Outrigger project, including a list of meaningful changes, public benefits and amenities, summaries of economic impacts, details on the restaurant and bar, the company's vision for the property, and next steps. Mr. Wilson addressed concerns about the increase in traffic, providing potential solutions to reduce vehicles coming in and out of the nearby area. Various photographs, illustrations, and renderings were provided to show what the property would look like, should the proposal be approved. Alexis Crespo, AICP, from RVI Planning + Landscape Architecture, provided a comprehensive plan and zoning overview for the Outrigger project. She summarized the comprehensive plan amendment and commercial planned development, focusing on the historical context and land use patterns in the immediately surrounding areas and throughout the island.

Elizabeth Fountain, P.E., from J.R. Evans Engineering, presented on the costal engineering and storm resiliency aspects of the proposed development. She outlined the resiliency measures and the benefits of the wave dissipation structure. She additionally noted that FEMA had provided a Conditional Letter of Map Revision acceptance as of June 18, 2025.

Ted Treesh, from TR Transportation, provided information on transportation and parking. He reported on the findings from the Traffic Impact Studies and Parking Memorandum. He explained the justifications for the parking deviations.

Brandon Frey, from J.R. Evans Engineering, presented on stormwater management and activities. Ms. Crespo returned to provide remarks on the project's consistency with the comprehensive plan and the LDC Rezone Criteria. Mr. Yovanovich concluded the presentation with an overview of the project's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, LDC, and town staff report. He additionally reiterated the positive impact this development would bring.

Mr. Green clarified, in terms of the applicant's statement of agreement with the conditions set forth by the town staff, that those were edits and recommendations during discussions. There may be a number of other conditions that may arise depending on the situation. There are no assurances for the quality component. These components may include policy, commercial planned development conditions, timing, and phasing. He noted that the Local Planning Agency should be as specific and as clear as possible about the requirements and limitations set forth in the comprehensive plan amendment. While revisions can come back before the agency, it is better to have these provisions at the start. Mr. Green stated that, with regard to density, staff tried to step away from the multiplier in the plan due to its ever-changing nature. They instead recommend looking at the raw numbers.

The Local Planning Agency recessed for approximately half an hour.

Chair Cereceda announced that all should return at 12:30 p.m.

Following the recess, Chair Cereceda asked if Mr. Green and Mr. Yovanovich had any additional remarks specific to the comprehensive plan amendment. Mr. Green stated, in regard to uses, that there are no blanket guarantees. The applicant, for example, would still need to go through the permitting process and FEMA approval. There was a question if such processes were unique to this property. He responded that it was not but did want to express a word of caution to the voting members. He again stressed the importance of specificity and clarity, which will help staff in the implementation stage. Mr. Sudduth asked for the previous height requirement and if there is a general limit. The planner responded that there was not but that zoning is where the parameters are implemented. Mr. Dunlap asked to revisit the factors that staff wishes the agency to think about as they consider the item, which Mr. Green then summarized. Mr. Yovanovich noted that there is specificity in the agenda packet in terms of height definition and density measurement. He stated that they could provide additional specifics if requested. They will do what is needed to accommodate the members, including adding or incorporating any further information into the plan.

Chair Cereceda stated the maximum height is 195 feet for every building and noted that it can be used across the board. Mr. Yovanovich provided they can attach the master plan amendment. There was a question as to how the applicant determined the FAR value of 3.0. Mr. Yovanovich included residential square footage when the plan does not require that. If the residential and parking were removed, it would be 2.25. There were further questions confirming the elements included. Mr. Green expressed his disagreement but noted that there are different methods of calculation.

Mr. Yovanovich read a portion of the language for reference and asserted that the applicant used an accepted definition. Chair Cereceda noted that the proposal was presented as a package and confirmed with Mr. Green that the calculations, under the applicant's method, were correct. She provided that these discussions and questions were intended so that both the agency and members of the public clearly understand the value and how it was reached.

Public Comment:

Chair Cereceda reminded members of the public who wish to speak to confine their remarks to the comprehensive plan amendment. Town Attorney Stuparich provided that the text amendment is on page 26. All members of the public who spoke confirmed that they were sworn in.

Lisa Wiseman, a resident of and property owner in Fort Myers Beach, emphasized earlier remarks that the agency should consider everyone in the community in its decision. She expressed concerns about the town's lifestyle and economics, as well as what this would mean for her own property. Ms. Wiseman voiced her support for the development. She does not have issues with the height limit and parking.

Arnold Schramel believes that this development is too much density on too small land. He stated the amendment would create an extreme deviation to the comprehensive plan. He acknowledged the loss of hotel rooms but noted that there is progress with condominiums, which are heavily rented out during the season. He asserted that the community will need to wait a long time for these new rooms. He requested the Local Planning Agency to deny and to allow the group to come back.

David Nusbaum is a resident of Estero Boulevard and second-generation owner. He also stated he was President of the Island Winds Condominium and Chair of MERTF but is not speaking on behalf of these groups. He described his and his family's connections to the community. He viewed the Outrigger property as part of the fabric of the 6000 block. While this structure is gone and cannot be replaced, he sees this proposed development as an opportunity and commented that there should be no delay. Mr. Nusbaum outlined the highlighted benefits the property would bring. The development would also bring in more children for the school. He asked the body to move this forward. Terry Cain requested for the property line to be projected again. She asserted that the map is not accurate and that the EPA, on its website, has a different property line. She described the portion on the map that she believes is additional space that should not be included. She views their plans as taking the public's land and is concerned about the wet sand line and scouring.

Nancy Walker, a resident of the south end of the island, noted that the comprehensive plan should not change for one entity. She believed the renderings are beautiful but claims the development is too large in scale. She argued that these plans would create high density, despite the objectives provided. She stated that golf carts would worsen the traffic. She echoed the previous speaker's remarks on the property lines.

Tom Harris, also a full-time resident, said that the community wants to live as efficiently as possible. He noted that the community also needs the facilities to be able to go to the beach. He is in support of considering this development for the community, believing that deviations should be awarded to someone who could be trusted.

Kevin Picolly believes that London Bay has lived up to everything the company has promised. He acknowledged that the group supports the property even when it was not necessary. Additionally, he noted that there is variation in economics and numbers but that real estate values will inarguably be decreasing.

Sarah Peck lives across the street from the Outrigger property. She believes that neighbors have not been consulted at all. She noted the vegetation change and requested a fence, as many guests may park at their properties to go next door. Referring to the renderings, she asserted that they did not show the nearby properties. She compared the new development to the past property and Margaritaville, which were both smaller in scale.

Jim Post provided that he was an attorney representing Cameron Nickie Post, owners who lived approximately nine houses away. His clients object to this development. He referenced his past e-mail communications on April 10, April 13, and April 14. He has requested that these messages be admitted into the record and that all the applications be consolidated. The owners purchased the property as a long-term life decision and an investment, enjoying the quiet, family-oriented area. The family has two small children and reside here full-time. They believe that the oversized commercial venture impairs the residential nature of the area. He announced that they hired a planner and would be part of the process. He noted their position against approval.

Marsha O'Brian stated that she was not contacted in terms of the development and that she is opposed to the comprehensive plan amendment. Her beliefs are that the property should be a medium-sized venture and that the current proposal is intrusive and not compatible with the residential area. She cited to the plan's objective of preserving residential areas.

Dennis E. feels that the storm destroyed the island and that recovery is too slow for the south end. He sees this project as an opportunity for this part of the community. He said that it means a lot for a local company to propose developments. He emphasized that London Bay has the money and the backing for the project.

Dave O'Brian is a resident and board member of Gulfside Twelve. Voicing his opposition, he stated that wedging a mixed-use development would be detrimental to the surrounding residential properties. He is also concerned about higher traffic. Mr. O'Brian noted that a beach access exists nearby and does not believe that another one is needed. He also pointed out the lack of noise buffers for alcohol-serving properties. He urged the LPA not to approve and to have the developer come back with changes.

Tim Sweeney stated that it is challenging to sustain such large developments. There are water pressure, drainage, plumbing issues that are not addressed. He has no issues with the company but opposes the proposal and its size.

He asked the body to consider what was there before. He provided that he and the group against the project were not impervious to change but that they did want a voice in the process.

Tom Brady said that any change to the comprehensive plan should be for the benefit of the public. He believes that the numbers presented are not reflective and that incremental values should be used. He requested the financial team, or experts, be sworn in or that the agency defer to the staff.

Mr. Brady is concerned that another entity may take over in the future, causing some of the benefits to disappear. He also mentioned that, while this project may benefit the island as a whole, nearby residential houses may suffer.

Dave Kelly voiced his support for the project. He expressed his understanding of some of the concerns raised. He believes that the south end of the island desperately needs this development as an anchor for the community. He requested that the LPA look at the greater whole.

Wendy Sweeney lives across the street at Estero Boulevard. They purchased their property shortly before Hurricane Ian. She echoed the remarks on drainage, water pressure, and parking issues. She also cited concerns about ditches and flooding. While she acknowledged London Bay as a company, she did not like the project, its size, and the decreased privacy it would bring.

Public comment closed.

Mr. Yovanovich noted that ownership is for their property and is accurately shown in the survey. Staff was part of the review. He appreciated everyone coming and voicing their opinions. He mentioned the number of those who spoke in favor of the project, which he believes is often rare for these types of proposals. He believes there are dire consequences if this item is not approved. He repeated that the applicant is willing to make accommodations as needed to ensure consistency with the plan. He provided 50 letters of support in advance and wanted to recognize those communications.

Chair Cereceda requested that Mr. Green review each element before discussion and the ultimate vote. There were no objections to permanent use. For defined public benefits, the Chair asked if the approval would mean that the town would recognize all listed items. Mr. Green believes that it would memorialize benefits that may or may not be completed. Town Attorney Stuparich also noted that it was a finite list. There was a question whether the public benefits list should exclude code requirements. Mr. Green also noted that the bathrooms were not on the list, despite being presented as a benefit by the applicant. There were discussions on removing this provision. Mr.

Dunlap asked what would happen to the remaining elements. The Chair stated that this particular provision can be removed and that the plan can retain its intended broad nature.

The body then turned to consideration of the height and stories for this project. Mr. Sudduth noted his concerns about the proposed height. Mr. Boan recalled Mr. Green's prior remarks on specificity, clarity, and consistency. Mr. Yovanovich noted that the actual height is measured from grade and is 198 feet. The height provided from minimum flood elevation is 195. Architect Miguel Campo, of 10 Design, introduced himself.

He has never been qualified as an expert before the agency before. His company has experience with mixed-use hospitality projects.

Mr. Dunlap moved to accept Mr. Campo as an expert, seconded by Mr. Boan. There were no objections.

Mr. Campo noted that codes have different definitions of height. Based on real flood elevation from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, they began by measuring from the mean height. He provided 198 feet as the perceived height, from the sand to the crown. Mr. Green asserted that the number should be around 177 feet, not 195 feet. Mr. Yovanovich stated the applicant wanted to provide the truth in advertising. Mr. Eckmann asked Mr. Green if in the comprehensive plan mentions the type of elevation for measurements. He responded that it is location-specific but that standard practice may entail the use of the DEP elevation. He noted that any fixed amount or point should be fine. Ms. Plummer objected to the 177 feet height and would like to see the 195 number changed. She believes the structure is too tall. Responding to Mr. Boan's questions on the measurement, Senior Planner Jason Smalley noted that there is generally no fill allowed in this zone and the lot is already 4-5 feet above sea level. Mr. Boan noted that he had no further issues. Chair Cereceda asked if there was a concern about 177 feet being a blanket number across the entire parcel, as opposed to a specific building. There were discussions on this limitation and the maximum value that should be set. Mr. Yovanovich made a suggestion to attach the master plan with a number of stories to the comprehensive plan as an exhibit. Chair Cereceda recommended that if this is incorporated, the heights and stories requirement could simply stipulate "as approved in the commercial plan." Mr. Green stated it would be possible but noted his preference against the use of pictures. Mr. Yovanovich asked if one of the criteria would be that the comprehensive plan has to be adopted on the same date as the CPD.

Town Attorney Stuparich is concerned about consistency and referred to Mr. Green's recommendation of a list of the buildings with the dimensions as a compromise. Mr. Sudduth proposed a 158 feet height restriction. Mr.

Yovanovich stated the applicant would prefer to keep residents in the residential building and the hotel guests in the hotel building. There was a question about the size of the condominium units. Mr. Wilson responded that they were between 2000-3500 square feet, with penthouses being around 4,000 square feet. Chair Cereceda reminded the applicant about the compromise for the Margaritaville property, which was a controversial proposal that ended up being a unanimous vote by Council. She asked that he consider the accommodations, which are offered in the spirit of collaboration. Ms. Plummer noted that there is no view corridor in this case. There was also a comment that this development would still be plausible to

develop with the lower restriction. Mr. Yovanovich asked if flexibility would be allowed if they meet the height restrictions. Town Attorney Stuparich noted that there is still more discussion. Mr. Wilson asked to confirm that this would mean lowering the residential tower by about two stories but allowing for additional levels for the other buildings.

He did have a concern because the company had already lowered the stories before the final proposal and still wish to prioritize design. He believes that the height difference is difficult to ascertain. He said that condominium units were worth more than hotel portion and asked if there was a different alternative.

Mr. Boan requested that the LPA consider two factors: 1) that the other mixed use zoning districts are all east of Estero Boulevard so that the intensity of the density is not on the beach; and 2) that the other districts have multiple users and owners and if there would be any issues with a site-specific comprehensive plan amendment and the precedent this may set. Mr.

Schoonover believes it does set a precedent, but he notes that this paves a viable way for developers in the future. Ms. Plummer does not like making something unique for a developer or specific case but noted that the agency is not rewriting history by doing so. Responding to Mr. Eckmann's inquiry on the need to consider this amendment, Mr. Green stated that anyone has the right to apply to do so under state law. The alternative is that an individual could pull an existing category and then ask the site be amended to that category. The applicant wishes to amend the plan and create a new category that is site-specific. Mr. Eckmann asked if there were additional avenues without the comprehensive plan. There was a response that existing categories have guardrails with FAR limit and that the applicant could be able to do so with a long list of deviations. Mr. Sudduth does not have any issues with the factors that James brought up. Mr. Dunlap believed that a precedent is not set and that there is no commingling of property proposals.

Chair Cereceda then moved on to the FAR element. She understands the emotional reaction to the higher value, especially when residents were used to a lower number. She commented that there needed to be a justification for the larger building mass. There were discussions amongst the agency members about the higher value and the public benefits it could bring.

Members recognized the difficulty in having a tangible way to see these higher FAR values. Mr. Green and Mr. Smalley were asked if they agree with the comments that the mixed-use nature would increase the value from 2.25 to 3. Mr. Green noted that the FAR is a measurement tool but does not reflect design. He understands that there are trade-offs and it may come up again in future projects.

The Chair moved to the topic of density. Mr. Green stated he did not like the term "hotel/condominium" and noted there is a mixing of terminology. There was a question about the significance of the wording. He responded that additional permanent traffic can significantly impact a barrier island. The hotel portion would also mean additional tax revenue. Mr. Yovanovich believed that the hotel would be owned by one entity or sold to individuals who agree to centralized management. The applicant hopes for individual ownership within a rental pool. He agrees to clarification that would remove the condominium wording. Mr. Green emphasized transient use. Chair Cereceda noted that Mr. Eckmann had to leave at 3:00 pm. Mr. Wilson believed that the market feedback would be that families would be able to get multi-bedroom accommodations. Margaritaville provided feedback that there were not enough suites on the island.

The company's target clients are families for transient use. Chair Cereceda quoted the proposed language. Mr. Sudduth recommended using "hotel units" instead of "hotel rooms." The new language will now be that "the proposed development is for 150 hotel and 46 multifamily units. The permitted density is 41 dwelling units per acre, subject to the hotel equivalency factor established for the Pedestrian Commercial Future Land Use Category (FLUC) in the Town of Fort Myers Beach Land Development Code (LDC)..., and inclusive of hotel and multifamily units." Chair Cereceda read the development standards. She then outlined the results. There were discussions on implementing a restriction on the number of stories. Mr. Wilson noted that this change would mean he would lose 2 stories or 8 of the highest value units. He asserted that it would be difficult to make up for that loss. Chair Cereceda reminded him that the agency is not the final decision-maker. Mr. Wilson can also choose not to concede, but Council would make the final decision. There theoretically would be room for flexibility. The applicant agreed but noted his reluctance. Mr. Green provided that hotel rooms do not count towards density, only residential units do. The Outrigger property had 144 units hotel rooms. It was pointed out that the comprehensive plan has an atypical conversion. The numbers were spelled out, and it was stated the density value should not matter. Mr. Eckmann respects his colleagues' opinions and wishes for them to vote without him. He made some final remarks before leaving. He believes the number is unimportant and said that the height is the sticking point for him, as he does not wish for a compromise in the design. Chair Cereceda asked staff if the density provisions are adequate. The staff commented that the sentence with, "The permitted density is..." was unnecessary. He confirmed with the applicant's attorney. The attorney said that trading for hotel rooms is not an unreasonable request due to the lowered height. Square footage would be broken down to more hotel rooms. Mr. Yovanovich noted that one residential unit equals the hotel rooms. Chair Cereceda said those numbers need to be memorialized into the plan. There was discussion between the agency members and the applicant and his attorney on a number and a possible provision on flexibility. Chair Cereceda ordered a recess for ten minutes.

Following the break, the applicant requested a continuance to discuss and research on the feasibility of the language provided today. Mr. Wilson hopes for council meetings in May and June and acknowledged the pressure on timing. There were no objections to a continuance. Town Attorney Stuparich clarified that this would be a continuance for all items on the agenda related to London Bay and noted that they would need to be until a date certain.

Additionally, the Chair would need to open the public hearing for each item, and the agency would need to move and consider continuance separately. Following discussion, May 8th at 9:00 a.m. was determined to be the best date and time. Addressing concerns about the Florida Sunshine Law, Town Attorney Stuparich stated that the rule only applied to communications between two Council members. The applicant consented to the scheduled continuance.

Mr. Boan moved to approve a continuance of the hearing on Ordinance 26-04: CPA20240067, 6200 Estero Blvd, Outrigger Resort Mixed-use: CPA-Text until May 8, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., seconded by Ms. Plummer.

The motion carried unanimously.

- B. Ordinance 26-03; CPA20240067, 6200 Estero Blvd, Outrigger Resort Mixed-use CPA- Map
FUTURE LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT (LEGISLATIVE)

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA AMENDING TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH FUTURE LAND USE MAP-2045, ADOPTED DECEMBER 1, 2025, FOR THE PORTION OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6200 ESTERO BLVD, IDENTIFIED AS STRAP # 33-46-24-W3-00012.0000 THAT IS LANDWARD OF THE 1978 COASTAL CONSTRUCTION CONTROL LINE, IN 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. Public Comment:

Terry Cain spoke about the concerns about the maps shown early today and the property lines. She believes that it should go to wet sand line and not to the tide zone.

Public comment closed.

Mr. Dunlap moved to approve a continuance of this hearing to a date certain of May 8, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., Ms. Plummer seconded.

The motion carried unanimously.

- C. Ordinance 26-05, CPD20240061, 6200 Estero Blvd., Outrigger Resort Mixed-use
REZONING REQUEST (QUASI-JUDICIAL)

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA APPROVING/APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS/DENYING A REZONING OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6200 ESTERO BLVD, FORT MYERS BEACH, GENERALLY IDENTIFIED AS STRAP NUMBER 33-46-24-W3-00012.0000 FROM A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED COMMERCIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (OUTRIGGER BEACH RESORT) TO A COMMERCIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT WITH 12 DEVIATIONS TO ALLOW FOR A 46 DWELLING UNITS; 150 HOTEL ROOM AND 46000 SQUARE FEET OF

COMMERCIAL USE AND 340 PARKING SPACES; PROVIDING FOR OTHER CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Cereceda read the title of the ordinance. Town Attorney Stuparich stated that the quasi-judicial portion can be preserved for the next meeting and that there is no need for disclosures for ex parte communications at this meeting.

Public comment:

David O'Brien asked if this would be the only opportunity for public comment or if there would be other options. He stated that he has no comments at this time. Public comment closed.

Ms. Plummer moved to approve a continuance of this hearing to a date certain of May 8, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., seconded by Mr. Schoonover. The motion carried unanimously.

D. SEZ20240112, 6200 Estero Blvd., Outrigger Resort Mixed-Use Special Exception

SPECIAL EXCEPTION - CONSTRUCTION IN EC (QUASI-JUDICIAL)

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA APPROVING/ APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS/DENYING SPECIAL EXCEPTION SEZ20240112 TO ALLOW RECONSTRUCTION OF A MAJOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE IN THE ENVIRONMENTALLY CRITICAL (EC) ZONING DISTRICT AS AUTHORIZED BY SECTION 6-366 OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6200 ESTERO BOULEVARD; PROVIDING FOR SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Cereceda read the title of the resolution. Public comment:

David O'Brien requested that the body urge the developer to move the tiki bar to a more centralized location, where it originally was on the old property. He stated that there is currently no activity buffer in its current spot.

Terry Cain is concerned about allowing something to be built in an environmentally critical zone, which she believes could create a precedent. She noted that she would not be able to attend the continuance of this hearing.

Sarah Peck echoed previous comments of relocating the tiki bar to the center.

Public comment closed.

Ms. Plummer had a question regarding the environmentally critical zone and requested that a picture of the building be provided in the future. Mr. Dunlap and Mr. Sudduth provided that a small store used to exist there.

Mr. Schoonover moved to approve a continuance of this hearing to a date certain of May 8, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., seconded by Ms. Plummer.

The motion carried unanimously.

E. SEZ20240112, 6200 Estero Boulevard COP

SPECIAL EXCEPTION - COP (QUASI-JUDICIAL)

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA APPROVING/ APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS/DENYING SPECIAL EXCEPTION SEZ20240112 TO ALLOW EXPANSION OF CONSUMPTION ON PREMISES IN THE ENVIRONMENTALLY CRITICAL (EC) ZONING DISTRICT AS PER LDC

SECTION 34-1264. (G)(1). FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6200 ESTERO BOULEVARD; PROVIDING SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Cereceda read the title of the resolution. No public comment.

Mr. Dunlap moved to approve a continuance of this hearing to a date certain of May 8, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., seconded by Ms. Plummer.

The motion carried unanimously.

Town Attorney Stuparich commented that the Town Manager and Town Mayor can establish the date of the special meeting.

F. VAR20250299, 6200 Estero Blvd. (Outrigger Redevelopment)
VARIANCE (QUASI-JUDICIAL)

A RESOLUTION OF THE FORT MYERS BEACH LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY APPROVING/ APPROVING WITH CONDITIONS/ DENYING VAR 20250299, REQUESTING A VARIANCE OF 15 FEET REDUCTION TO THE REQUIRED 25-FOOT SIDE YARD SETBACK FOR AN ACCESSORY STRUCTURE TO THE OUTRIGGER RESORT IN THE EC ZONING DISTRICT TO ALLOW A 10 FOOT SIDE YARD SETBACK IN ORDER TO ACCOMMODATE HISTORICAL LOCATION OF THE TIKI HUT, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6200 ESTERO BLVD, GENERALLY REFERRED TO AS STRAP NUMBER: 33-46-24-W3-00012.0000 IN FORT MYERS BEACH; AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER CLARIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS OF LAW, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Cereceda read the title of the resolution. Public comment:

Terry Cain has concerns about the setbacks.

David O'Brien does not wish for the setback to be so close to their properties.

He believes that the tiki bar should be placed in the middle.

Public comment closed.

Mr. Boan moved to approve a continuance of this hearing to a date certain of May 8, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., seconded by Ms. Plummer.

The motion carried unanimously.

X. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

No items.

XI. LPA MEMBERS ITEMS/REPORTS

Ms. Plummer announced the health awareness event on April 18 and 19. Mr. Boan welcomed Mr. Schoonover.

Chair Cereceda stated that she would like to see the public benefits ordinance on the agenda before the summer.

XII. LPA ATTORNEY ITEMS/REPORTS

Town Attorney Stuparich requested that, for future meetings, the language for the items be projected on the screen and be modified as the discussions evolve. Chair Cereceda stated they could do something similar to what was done for the Charter Review Commission and expressed her thanks.

XIII. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ITEMS/REPORTS

No items.

XIV. ITEMS FOR NEXT MONTHS AGENDA

Mr. Dunlap and Mr. Sudduth notified Town Clerk Baker that they would not be present for the next meeting on April 21, 2026.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dunlap moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Sudduth. The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Minutes adopted as presented, May 8, 2026. Motion by LPA Member Dunlap and seconded by LPA Member Schoonover. Passed 6-0.



Amy Baker, Town Clerk