

Captiva Community Panel
MINUTES
Feb. 10, 2015

Attending: David Rohn, David Mintz, Jack Cunningham, Mike Kelly, Jay Brown, Jerry McClure, Bob Walter, Dave Jensen, Sandy Stilwell

Audience: 25

Meeting convened 9:05 a.m. Following introductions, the Jan. 13 minutes were unanimously approved (Rohn/Cunningham).

CEPD: *Administrator Kathy Rooker:* Next meeting is Wednesday, open to public, Tween Waters Inn in the Wakefield Room. Post and rope to protect plant, 4800 linear feet of rope replaced, nylon will stand up better to sun and weather. *Rohn:* Blind Pass status? *Rooker:* County monitoring shoaling. *Walter:* Comes and goes? *Rooker:* Sand moving around based on waves and tides.

CFD: *Deputy Chief Jeff Pawul:* Station end of this month for completion. Move in end of March, open house in April. *Mintz:* White line on curve needs to be repainted. Parking for contractors... will they fix damage from vehicles? *Pawul:* Not supposed to park there, can discuss with contractors. *Walter:* Common courtesy to do that. *Cunningham:* Flooding in Green Flash area. Lee DOT needs to address.

LCSO: *Deputy First Class Joe Caiazza:* Nothing major, typical parking. Working with bike clubs on sharing the road. *Nathalie Pyle:* Dogs on beach, worst 7-7:30 a.m.

Hurricane: *Doris Holzheimer:* Daniel Noah at Captiva Island Yacht Club March 17 at 10 a.m. Open to public. Storm prep at new fire station in May 7, 3:30 p.m.

South Seas: *Jose Gonzalez, David Depew, Bill Morris:* Introductions. *Gonzalez:* Where we are today... back to the drawing board to react to comment made. Recap of old plans. Impact on golf course, club, parking from South Seas Club. Removed northern building, 16 units. Retain clubhouse as is, carts will be kept elsewhere. Reworked parking on north side. Extends parking on Harbourside side further north. Five more spaces. Showed new renderings. Now 96 units north, 44 units south? Three buildings in employee housing site. Completes development rights at that point, other development would come from other parties. Identical units in quality and appearance to those proposed for the north end. Expand one unit to make a larger suite. Security issues, would rework entrance to keep it inside the secure boundaries of the resort. Translated units within the larger resort. Limit impacts on north end neighbors. Feel we've done the best we can to mitigate impacts. Traffic impacts... *Morris.* Discussion of peaks winter/spring and summer 74% occupancy average at peak, 60% annually. Concerns we have with traffic. 471 units under our control.

McClure: 140 included in peak occupancy? *Walter:* No, occupied but not part of occupancy, counted in traffic. ??? 140 empty units at peak, what's need for additional 140? *Gonzalez:* Money. Guests request changed needs for units, rooms can limit occupancy if people want larger or smaller units. *Mike Frascati:* 140 fully occupied, how many people does that add? *Gonzalez:* 640 if four per room, 840 if packed at 6 per room. *Frascati:* Impact on amenities in peak? *Gonzalez:* Critical mass for hotel allows you to support critical mass for amenities. ??? Resort and associations. Ownership issues. Could associations add density to bring down fees? *Gonzalez:* Not an option today. Rights are owned by

resort, not individual property owners. Discussion of property rights. *Frascati*: Lockout issues... put resort over 912 units. *McClure*: Tear down 140 and return lockouts? ??? Worker housing in agreement, this is a swap to create hotel units. *Gonzalez*: 2008 agreement, 100 units for hotel, 40 units either/or hotel or employee. Still committed to employee housing. *Walter*: Can use rental units if we establish a lease. *Gonzalez*: Most live on mainland. *Walter*: 78 units occupied at peak. *Gonzalez*: Can put housing wherever it wants to as long as it meets the commitment to on-site housing. Demolishing housing and rebuilding housing. Housing throughout the resort, but must provide units we committed to. *Walter*: Contractor will be responsible for housing their employees. ??? 2008 agreement should have gone to public hearing, end run around process. County failed to address public needs at that time. Really dropped the ball by doing this administratively.

Mintz: 912 unit cap was from 3 units per acre. Why does resort have control of 140, usurping units from the PUD overall? *Depew*: 2002 agreement allocated those units to each development and property. *Walter*: If they owned land they could build units if they destroyed the same number elsewhere. Discussion of zoning and density. Which section had how many units, list read. Discussion of Mariner units and right to build. *Gonzalez*: Can rearrange on any lot we own, but not other's lots. ??? Projections of occupancy after new units are online. ??? How will units be addressed? *Gonzalez*: Straight hotel rooms. *Walter*: Max of six people, expect four. *Lisa Riordan*: Projection of shifted from current rental units to your hotel units? *Gonzalez*: Can't predict movement, hoping to provide desired products and ranges to bring in people who aren't here now. *Riordan*: Percentage of income, rentals vs. hotel. Discussion of rates and product. *Walter*: Buyers for all units, changing design will have an impact as well. *Gonzalez*: Goal to make money and improve resort. As palatable and convenient as we can. ??? Population density, unclear on concept. B&B example. *Gonzalez*: Discussion of units and mix of products. Traffic isn't always tied to units. *Frascati*: Improves cash flow for hotel. Kitchen doesn't sway guests. *Fred Newman*: Are you taking in new rental units into the resort system? *Walter*: Case by case basis. 60% occupancy so why would I take on units I can't fill. Discussion. *Cunningham*: Why not build on Resort Island, or use as parking facility. *Stan Barton*: Views compromised with 7 buildings, will six buildings improve views? *Gonzalez*: Everything on the golf course stays the same, and clubhouse.

Rohn: 74% average occupancy... units hotel owns and guaranteed lease and in rental program. *Mintz*: Where did units come from in allocation? *Depew*: Changed inn 2008 from employee housing. 100 hotel or 40 hybrids. Same allocation, changing and specifying where units are located. *Brown*: Bulk of housing now at south end of resort, has right to distribute throughout the resort or to north end. Moving units from underutilized area to overused area. *Gonzalez*: 2008 complex as identical footprint to what we're proposing, included restaurant in the middle. Works better for resort now, but impact will be same as 2008. We can build 2008 plans now, impact will be just as large. We just think this proposal is a better product for revenue and resort. *Mintz*: Take away Building A and B and I'd agree with you. Density on north end will be higher with this. *Morris*: Internal traffic distributions, 96 north and 44 south... AM and PM peaks 54 trips and 56 trips with proposal 14 kept internally. Employee housing gross numbers high 78 & 83, marginally different for internal 10 & 11. During the peak hour. *Gonzalez*: Did not study current, since it fluctuates all the time. Have to set out counters and massive traffic study. *Depew*: What is internal impact on resort was question we tried to answer. *Frascati*: Timing for workers and deliveries factored in. *Gonzalez*: Figured out in overall traffic calculations. Overall buildout is calculated in infrastructure.

Mintz: Major change that will have real impacts in the real world... not calculations. Low density development and emphasis on pedestrian traffic in 2002. The 2008 amendment talked about keeping

people on the resort through amenities. This proposal will mean more people traveling on Captiva or Sanibel. What will impact on Captiva be from these new units and guests, traffic it will produce in this community? *Gonzalez*: Traffic capacity is already there, not adding units to rights already existing here. Change has an impact, but we're also preserving our rights to build. *Brown*: Can you tell us what to expect when you build these units? *Gonzalez*: Wish we could limit cars and increase shuttles and walking. Peak hour and peak occupancy, impact is similar to what is here now. *Walter*: Not an exact science. ??? Just trying to understand impact on top of what we have now. Discussion.

??? Did try to mitigate impact based on the last meeting. What can be done from the gate to the north end to make experience of walking and biking better. *Gonzalez*: More use of shuttle, less use of cars. ??? Mitigation by improving road, putting in bike lane. *Gonzalez*: Not directly linked, but it will happen. *Depew*: Hotel doesn't own all of the road. Some associations do object to cost. *Stilwell*: Traffic improvements could make flow better. MSTU to improve road? *Gonzalez*: Traffic improvements will take all the associations and owners as well as the resort operators. Some increase north to south, trying to show peak impact. ??? Way to show split north to south with traffic calculations? *Gonzalez*: Internal movement depends on amenities, not just units. *Frascati*: Blackstone wants all associations to participate in road costs. We think it's a resort issue. *Mintz*: Increase in daily trips in old proposal, does this change that? *Morris*: No real change. *Mintz*: External trips the community has to recognize. 500 daily trips by 100 new hotel units in 2008, is that the same number we need to deal with now? Discussion. 100 units to 479 daily trips, what would 40% more units mean?

??? Not to your advantage to create a traffic nightmare. Huge influx of traffic on a daily basis. *Gonzalez*: No question there will be an impact with new units. We are not exceeding our rights to develop and how can we mitigate impacts. *Morris*: 478 trips not adjusted for peak occupancy, so at peak will be off by 25% and lower off peak. *Ann Bradley*: Will be impact on traffic throughout the community. Will need to be some kind of mitigation to handle cars and bicycles. Needs to be part of the plan. *Kelly*: Tried to use our meetings as forum to talk about the issues. Either administrative or requires a hearing, based on county decision. Panel interest is looking at impact on Captiva overall. Can't use units as representative of density, but it's better reflection of demand on the community. Additional people on South Seas, no question, will impact the island and how we mitigate it. Can't increase width of road due to mangroves. Movement of people around the island. Trolley is a partial solution, not the answer. Everyone is increasing density, not units, and we need to try to deal with that impact. Have taken all your messages to panel and transmitted to county, taken minutes of meetings and also sent those to the county. A lot of movement from the resort so far. *Depew*: Thanks to panel for allowing us to come and present this to the community. We will come back to share more of our thinking and design. *Kelly*: New things or new commitments, come back to share with the community.... road, traffic, movement. *Jensen*: Timeline from county for decision? *Depew*: Still have to resubmit plans to county for review. *Kelly*: Panel can track that and inform community. *Stilwell*: CFD issue with access to building? *Gonzalez*: Solved it with removal of building. *Mintz*: Certification of wastewater capacity? Plantation preserve parcel in original agreement? ??? Evacuation timing? *Depew*: Part of total 912 units. *Walter*: Trolley limited access a few years back. Is there a noticeable difference in traffic north and south? ??? Yes, open it all owners and guests. *Walter*: Will consider that. *Depew*: Eliminate parking on north end and no one could take a car up there... and nobody likes that. Discussion. *Walter*: Twice annual meeting with all association presidents to discuss our common interests.

Bylaws: *Cunningham*: Re-establish bylaws committee: Jack Cunningham, Jay Brown, Jerry McClure, David Mintz, David Rohn, Doris Holzheimer.

Mintz: Send letter to Rachel Peach and Sandy Stilwell for enclosing dumpsters in Village. Two houses, end of Wightman and duplexes binder and Old Lodge. People have reached out to county for more than a year, no change and attractive nuisances. Discussion. Nationstar has it now, both of them. Can panel ask county to expedite action. Bike/ped easy fix in Village. Need action on this. Figure out long short and medium term priorities for panel set a discussion time.

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Captiva Plan update workshop

Session convened as public workshop on Captiva Update: Kelly left... Stilwell chaired.

Max Forgey: Introduced county staff... Sharon Jenkins-Owen, Pam Houck, Nettie Richardson. Introduction. Changes since Jan 13.

Changes...

Village exception... *McClure*: Too broad. *Jensen*: Shows that change is possible. *Stilwell*: Specifying Village not a bad thing. *Cunningham*: Don't name Village maybe other places. *Mintz*: Why did this come up? *Brown*: No encouraging of variances. *McClure*: Allows more restrictive rules. Specify change or you'll run into issues. *Brown*: Plus to have the ability to customize rules. *McClure*: Tie to lot size? *Mintz*: Specify areas – Village/TW/Gold Coast/ SS. Limit to those areas.

Research lot platting issues in Village. Mintz will send info.

Utilities: Will be consider if supported by the affected property owners.

Mixed use... discussion of commercial /res units.

Policy 13.4.1 – exclude South Seas units from rental limits (Brown/Cunningham), unanimous approval.

Set meetings – after panel meetings in March and April, see if more are needed.

Workshop adjourned 12:15 p.m.

-- ***Ken Gooderham, administrator***