



MINUTES

**FORT MYERS BEACH
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
TOWN HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2523 ESTERO BOULEVARD
FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA 33931**

October 11, 2011

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Joanne Shamp; other members present:

Alan Smith
John Kakatsch
Bill Van Duzer
Hank Zuba
Al Durrett
Jane Plummer

LPA Attorney, Marilyn Miller
Staff Present: Walter Fluegel, Community Development Director
Tina Ekblad, Planning Coordinator
Keith Laakkonen, Environmental Sciences Coordinator

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. INVOCATION – Bill Van Duzer

Local Planning Agency Members introduced themselves and gave a brief synopsis of their background and experience.

IV. MINUTES

A. Minutes of September 13, 2011

MOTION: Mr. Zuba moved to approve September 13, 2011 minutes; second by Mr. Kakatsch.

Ms. Shamp noted a minor scrivener's error on Page 15 to be corrected – "...she recommended having one scheduled~~one~~ as outlined in their procedural manual."

VOTE: Motion passed 7-0

V. Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) Presentation

Community Development Director Fluegel introduced Mr. Jim LaRue of LaRue Planning and Management Services, Inc. who conducted the visioning services for the Town.

Mr. Jim LaRue, LaRue Planning and Management Services, Inc., distributed a handout and reviewed some legislative changes such as but not limited - previously an EAR was necessary every seven years and now the Town would only need a letter in 2014; the State would no longer have a Department of Community Affairs; expedited review; and optional concurrency. He summarized the visioning process which was conducted to assist in updating the Comprehensive Plan; and reported there was a great response and attendance at the two Visioning Workshops by the residents. He briefly discussed the results of the information garnered from the public at the Workshops and noted the Town's "community character". Mr. LaRue's presentation consisted of a review of the "Vision Our Town – The Results" which was a summary report outlining the input received at the Visioning Sessions that included comments on items such as:

- 'Keep it funky'; protect residential from commercial; Town Hall questions; consolidation of public facilities; protection of natural resources – water quality; infrastructure – bridge widening, transportation, parking improvements, and 'streetscaping'; sewer and water improvements; art facilities, etc.

He continued his presentation of the data collected from the Visioning Sessions, and reviewed within Section 5 of the Report recommended changes to the Comprehensive Plan based on the outcome statements that had received a 'super majority'. He explained how they based the recommendations on the input received and what seemed the most pressing in terms of Comprehensive Plan changes. He noted the page on legislative changes and reported the Town was now permitted to changes to the Comp Plan under the Expedited Review Process. He mentioned the comparison results on Page 5 of the Report with the 2007 EAR where the relocation of Estero Boulevard and the use of a roundabout were discussed, and the use of TIF within the CRA.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification of the term 'Downtown District' which was used several times within the document.

Community Development Director Fluegel described the approximately boundaries of the 'Downtown District'.

Ms. Shamp noted a map of the area contained in the back of the Comp Plan that indicated boundaries.

Community Development Director Fluegel thanked Mr. LaRue and his team for a great job in collecting all the information, then digesting it and translating it, and the creation of the final report. He noted the document was a good starting point for the conversation of updating the Comp Plan, and suggested the

LPA study the document closely in preparation for their future work related to the EAR and Comp Plan. He reported the second survey was currently on-line and staff was trying to understand and narrow down the issues a little further (i.e. Tax Increment Funding in the Downtown). He discussed the importance of Page 40, Recommended Changes to the Comprehensive Plan, which was basically the results of an outsider reviewing the policies, noting inconsistencies, and suggesting the ones staff should take a look at and consider a change.

Ms. Shamp questioned how the LPA would be involved with the next step in the EAR process.

Community Development Director Fluegel reported staff would be entering into a transition period due to the resignation of Planning Coordinator Ekblad at the end of the month, and then the Town would need to hire a new Planning Coordinator who would then encounter a training process; therefore, it would more than likely be December or January when the LPA would enter into this topic again.

Planning Coordinator Ekblad noted there was a copy of the second survey included in the report from Mr. LaRue, and there was a summary of the survey results based upon the point in time when the packets were compiled.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Parasail Ordinance – Amending Chapter 27, Article IV of the Town of Fort Myers Beach Land Development Code

Ms. Shamp opened the hearing at 9:29 a.m.

Community Development Director Fluegel announced the Ordinance was posted.

LPA Attorney Miller read the title of the ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 27, ARTICLE IV OF THE TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, “ADDITIONAL RULES AND PROCEDURES APPLYING TO BOTH PERSONAL WATERCRAFT AND PARASAILING,” AMENDING SECTION 27-52, “PWVL AND PAL LICENSES THAT ARE PERMITTED; AMENDING SECTION 27-55, “TRANSFERABILITY OF PWVL AND PAL LICENSES; GRANDFATHER CLAUSE,” TO CLARIFY THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH SUCH LICENSES MAY BE TRANSFERRED TO A DIFFERENT LOCATION; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Environmental Scientist Laakkonen presented comments on behalf of the Town of Fort Myers Beach. He explained the proposed changes to the Code were the results of a parasail operator, who in 2010, proposed to move a licensed location and upon review of the land development codes it was determined there was conflicting language and inconsistencies in Chapter 27 regarding the cap on licenses and the conditions under which a vendor could move their business to a new location. He pointed out at that time the Town Council had to perform an Administrative Interpretation of the Land Development Code to determine whether the business owner could move their license to another location; and added that the Council did allow the business owner to move the license, and asked the Town Attorney and staff to

review Chapter 27 to propose amendments clarifying existing language and remove conflicts or ambiguities. He discussed minor changes such as but not limited to strike '~~grandfather clause~~' and replace it with non-conforming, and issues with the map. He stated staff had presented the LPA with the proposed changes; and the analysis by the Town Attorney and staff found the proposed language changes had no effect on any of the existing or future vendors, and would allow the Land Development Code to act more efficiently.

LPA Attorney Miller concurred with the presentation/comments of Environmental Scientist Laakkonen, and agreed there had been some ambiguities. She added that last year Council clearly indicated that the current seven businesses (no additional) would be able to transfer their license to a new location if requested. She stated that if one of the seven existing businesses went out of business, then another one would be allowed.

Public Comment opened.

No speakers.

Public Comment closed.

Environmental Scientist Laakkonen reported the proposed ordinance was reviewed by MRTF on January 12, 2011.

Mr. Durrett discussed his support for the ability of an existing parasail business to transfer their license to another location if needed.

Mr. Kakatsch concurred with Mr. Durrett and noted he strongly felt seven businesses were adequate.

Mr. Zuba questioned the basis for the proposed amendments.

LPA Attorney Miller explained proposed amendments to *Section 27-55, Transferability of PALs to new conforming locations may only be allowed when licenses fall below 6*; and that the problem was there were 7. She noted originally there was no spacing requirement between the businesses.

Discussion ensued regarding spacing and transferability; and LPA Attorney stated the business which was displaced by Crescent Park still needed to meet the spacing requirements.

Mr. Zuba questioned naming requirements in the code and how did the Town keep track of name changes for the owner and/or business names.

Environmental Scientist Laakkonen explained when businesses change owners they were required each September to apply for a new license, and at that point they indicate any change in ownership of the company, which would include information regarding positions such as the chief executive.

Discussion ensued regarding the Town's process concerning licensing changes, ownership changes, insurance requirements, and business location changes.

Mr. Smith questioned Section 27-55 regarding transferability to non-conforming locations and if Section 27-55(3) should be 'non-conforming' and not 'conforming'.

LPA Attorney Miller explained that the section pertained to any location – conforming or non-conforming.

Ms. Plummer concurred with the previous comments of the Board Members.

Mr. Kakatsch questioned if a million dollar insurance liability was sufficient for the Town, or should it be increased to two million dollars.

LPA Attorney Miller explained the Town was responsible for \$100,000/\$300,000 and had sovereign immunity under State law; and noted increased coverage might be needed by the business owner and the owner of the property being leased.

Discussion was held concerning insurance liability and coverage assessment by the Town.

MOTION: Mr. Van Duzer moved to approve that the LPA recommend to Town Council to approve and adopt the proposed Town ordinance amending the Personal Watercraft and Parasailing Article IV, Chapter 27 of the Town Land Development Code and recommend Findings and Fact and Conclusion with regard thereto; second by Mr. Kakatsch.

No discussion.

VOTE: Motion approved, 7-0.

Public legislative hearing on Parasail Ordinance – Amending Chapter 27, Article IV of the Town of Fort Myers Beach Land Development Code closed at 9:45 a.m.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Consumption on Premises (COP) Report

Ms. Shamp thanked Community Development Director Fluegel, Town staff, and the Town Attorney for such a comprehensive report on the COP.

Community Development Director Fluegel presented the COP Report to the LPA and reviewed highlights of the report:

- Purpose – to provide a comprehensive examination of the Consumption on Premises issue, specifically as it related to extending service from a licensed premise into the Environmentally

Critical (EC) Zoning District which would provide a basis for the critical decision-making regarding formulating an ordinance that would effectively regulate COP.

- Historical–Council rejecting LPA interpretations (COP should not be allowed in the EC Zoning District which is also the Recreation Future Land Use); precedents set by previously approved COPs; and the lack of clear policy prohibition in the Comp Plan. He noted staff’s belief the more objective and defensible approach to developing a regulatory framework would be to focus on identifying methods of mitigating impacts of COP in EC (specific conditions of approval that mitigate potentially negative impacts and identify specific geographic areas wherein the potential impacts of COP may be greater).
- Glossary of Terms – reviewed common or frequent terms/acronyms used in the report (i.e. COP was consumption on a licensed premises).
- Timeline - as it pertained to alcohol consumption, sales, and service he discussed the development of the County ordinances and approvals, the post-incorporation Town ordinances and resolutions (i.e. resolution creating the EC Zone in 2004), the treatment of COP in the code both past and present, and how this related to the Town’s Comprehensive Plan.
- Overview of the EC and COP –in 2008 a former Town Manager entered into a planning services contract with Murphy Consulting Group to prepare a report on COP. The current discussion about COP was initiated at the October 2008 LPA meeting with a broad dialog on COP in general. At the December 2008 LPA meeting the Policy Considerations and Options Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages Report was presented by Murphy Consulting Group, and while the report was more comprehensive in nature, dealing with the expanse of COP-related issues, including COP in the Recreation Future Land Use category, the discussion by the LPA focused in on COP in Recreation Future Land Use. He noted that at the December 2008 meeting, several LPA members indicated a belief that further expansion of COP in Recreation Land Use should be prohibited. In April 2009, the LPA moved to table the conversation regarding the draft COP ordinances until after a workshop could be held with Town Council. It was noted that in September 2009, a joint workshop of the Town Council and the LPA was held and one of the topics discussed was the COP in the EC; and specific conversation arose from Town Council about developing a more equitable regulatory scheme for dealing with COP in EC. He reported at the October 2009 LPA Meeting, during the Future Work Activities portion of the agenda, the LPA directed staff to draft a statement to Council stated that *“that the LPA, in its consideration of the consultant’s report, did not deem that the expansion of open container onto additional properties would not be appropriate...or something to that effect”*. At the November 2009 LPA meeting, staff presented a draft resolution on COP as directed by the LPA which in essence stated *“whereas the LPA finds that the expansion of the on-premises consumption of alcoholic beverages onto the Gulf beaches does not protect remaining natural resources...”*. At the November 15, 2010 Town Council Workshop, staff presented a memo dated November 8, 2010 that reviewed LPA Resolution 2009-24 and provided options for Council’s consideration; at the December 6, 2010 Town Council Meeting, Council voted 4-1 to reject the LPA’s Resolution and by rejecting the resolution made the determination that COP was a permissible use in EC. Director Fluegel noted that since this action was a legislative interpretation by Council, as provided for in Chapter 15 of the Comp Plan, a text amendment would be required to reverse that determination; and in a subsequent discussion and motion, Council decided that the Land Development Code was the appropriate place to regulate permissible uses such as COP and

directed staff to prepare an ordinance that treated COP in EC as a permitted ancillary use. He continued to review the historical background of the COP and the EC through today which was included in the COP Report dated October 6, 2011. Director Fluegel noted that staff conducted a comprehensive review and legal assessment of all approved COPs adjacent to EC for the entire length of the beach and reported the following:

A. 18 establishments of which 12 have been approved for COP in the EC (in some way, shape or form they were approved across that zoning line in the sand into the EC Zone); 7 of the 12 approvals came by special exception or special permits, and 2 of those approvals were by CPD (one State permit and one Administrative Approval). He pointed out that of the 12, 7 were located in the Downtown District and 5 were located outside the Downtown District; 6 were resorts (4 resorts outside of the Downtown District), 4 were restaurant/bars, 1 a restaurant, and 1 a bar; of the 12, 7 were approved for COP directly on the beach (not on a deck or elevated structure above the beach), and 3 approved with deck and railing. He noted 3 had consistency with closing hours (10:00 p.m.); and continued to review the analysis of approved COPs as contained on Page 39 of the COP Report. He cautioned the LPA regarding staff's use of aerial interpretation regarding the EC Zoning line from the County's GIS mapping and there could be physical surveys that contradict the EC Zoning line boundary. He discussed staff's analysis of commonalities in approvals for COP in EC Zones and their observations regarding approved COPs (i.e. outdoor entertainment). He noted that the concentrations of the COPs were contained within the Downtown District. Director Fluegel commented that staff's perception was that there was a lack of appropriate regulatory framework for the conditions of approval related to COP in EC; however, there had been some historic consistency in some limited regards as it related to the approval of COP in EC (i.e. the majority of COP approvals in EC were granted for establishments within the Downtown District and those granted outside the Downtown District were primarily granted to the larger resorts in Town). He explained staff believed there was a strong precedent for requiring future approvals within the Down District to require Special Exception approval and those outside the Downtown District to be limited to resorts by CPD zoning. He discussed staff's recommendation to the LPA to consider in crafting an ordinance as four primary zoning processes to regulate COP in EC:

1. Special Exception
2. Planned Development Zoning
3. Administrative Approval
4. Permitted Use

He reviewed possible location restrictions as described on Page 40 and potential conditions for approval as outlined on Page 41 (1-2a through 2n) of the COP Report.

Ms. Shamp noted the immensity of the COP topic; and she distributed a handout she prepared regarding considerations regarding the COP. She stated the COP Report clearly defined what Town Council had done in interpreting Chapter 15 of the Comp Plan, and it provided detailed information about the number of properties, and supplied a legal review of the existing properties. She explained that the Report would help the LPA determine how much expansion they may want, and how would they regulate it. She noted the importance of the precedents included in the Report. She stated she had

walked the entire length of the Downtown District and encouraged the LPA members to do the same; and she compiled a list of her findings from her walking tour which she also distributed. She reviewed her walking tour findings as it related to COP:

- Sign verbiage; consideration for consistency in wording
- Amount of equipment that covers the beach frontage and how it impacts the appearance of the beach (i.e. jet skis, carts, flags, sandwich signs, picnic tables/chairs, etc.)
- Use of ropes and posts

Question and answer session and discussions ensued between the LPA members and Community Development Director Fluegel and LPA Attorney Miller regarding the COP topic and the COP Report; license transferability; zoning requirements; how special exceptions run with the property; zoning restrictions; legislation by special exception; precedent of granting approvals by special exceptions; ABT licenses and zoning; three businesses with approved special exceptions and the location within each subject property where they were serving alcohol; the difference between COP rules for licensed establishments and private individuals; and the '78 Coastal Construction Control Line.

Planning Coordinator Ekblad explained that all of the properties along the beachfront that have an approved consumption on premises that crosses over the EC Zoning District, in effect, whether it was by the Town, the County or the State, showed that the use of consumption was acceptable in the EC Zoning District. She added that did not mean there could not be conditions of approval added; and the use has been set as a precedent and the Town needed to determine a way to make sure the use was acceptable and it remained contained in an acceptable manner (i.e. use of a deck or rope and post). She noted staff was looking for input on the COP from the LPA.

Discussion ensued regarding permitted uses and the EC line; and potential consistency for conditions or restrictions.

Community Development Director Fluegel stated that Top O'Mast did not have COP in the EC; they were not approved for it from a Town zoning perspective.

Discussion continued concerning the COP in the EC Zone; possible consideration for bringing current businesses up to present standards and how to do so (i.e. re-memorialize through a special exception, have an administrative process or a blanket coverage on all of them); requirements for all businesses (i.e. biodegradable plastic cups with the businesses name on it); supplemental conditions for a special exception for each applicant; serving alcohol on a deck versus the sand and the EC line; potential restrictions/consistency for outdoor entertainment; and the CPD process.

Community Development Director Fluegel asked if there was consensus of the LPA on any aspects of the COP (i.e. outside the Downtown should it be resorts only, etc.). If possible, he explained he would like to have some 'broad brush' consensus.

Ms. Shamp explained that on her 3-page handout she felt that could be considered – *should COP and EC be limited to an ancillary use and should the method of approval*, in order to give staff an idea of where the LPA was headed.

Ms. Plummer asked if there was an example of a business that had a COP which was not a restaurant, bar or resort.

Discussion ensued regarding various types of ancillary uses; questions of process (i.e. special exception); cost of enforcement of COP; and cost of special exception and planned development application for an applicant.

Ms. Shamp continued to review the list on her 3-page handout for LPA consensus:

- Should COP and EC be limited as an ancillary use and should it be restricted to principle uses such as bars, restaurants, and resorts – 6 ayes, and 1 undecided.
- Should the ancillary use be restricted within specific zoning districts – 5 ayes, 1 nay, and 1 undecided.
- Should resorts have regulations that are specifically different from the bars and restaurants in the Downtown Zoning District –3 ayes, 3 nays, and 1 undecided.
- Should the method of new approval be special exception –7 ayes.
- Should the method of CPD be used for rezoning for new resorts or new commercial developments that would require a CPD - 5 ayes, 1 nay, and 1 undecided.

Discussion was held concerning if the LPA was interested in recommending that service and consumption aspects be handled separately; or deal with consumption only.

Ms. Shamp continued to review the list on her 3-page handout for LPA consensus:

- Would you encourage new decks to be built seaward of the '78 Construction Line – 7 nays.
- Would lean toward existing decks and pool areas – 7 ayes.

Discussion was held regarding whether or not to define some type of property line for a business.

Ms. Shamp asked the LPA to continue reviewing the 3-page handout for further discussion at the next meeting.

Community Development Director Fluegel informed the LPA that he welcomed any of the LPA members to meet with him individually to discuss this matter further. He stated he would email the recommended 'conditions of approval' to the LPA for comment.

Ms. Shamp changed the order of agenda items.

VIII. LPA MEMBER ITEMS AND REPORTS

Ms. Shamp distributed a copy of proposed resolutions for past LPA members, Tom Cameron and Rochelle Kay.

MOTION: Mr. Van Duzer moved Rochelle Kay's resolution be approved; second by Mr. Kakatsch.

VOTE: Motion approved, 7-0.

MOTION: Mr. Zuba moved Tom Cameron's resolution be approved; second by Mr. Van Duzer.

VOTE: Motion approved, 7-0.

A. Election of LPA Committee Chair and Vice Chair

LPA Attorney Miller opened the floor for LPA Chair nominations.

Mr. Van Duzer nominated Joann Shamp for Chair.

No other nominations.

LPA Attorney Miller opened the floor for LPA Vice Chair nominations.

Mr. Van Duzer nominated Mr. Zuba.

No other nominations.

MOTION: Mr. Van Duzer moved to adjourn as the LPA and reconvene as the Historic Preservation Board; second by Mr. Zuba.

VOTE: 7-0.

**ADJOURN AS LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY AND RECONVENE AS HISTORIC
PRESERVATION BOARD
11:58 A.M.**

IX. HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Ms. Shamp changed the order of the HAC agenda; and described the responsibilities of the HPB Committee Chair and Vice Chair positions.

C. Election of HPB Committee Chair and Vice Chair

Ms. Shamp asked if there was someone interested in historic preservation.

Ms. Plummer stated she served on that board previously; however, now she had a conflict with Thursday meeting days.

Discussion was held regarding anticipated meeting days and the role of the Chair and Vice Chair.

Mr. Kakatsch stated he would be interested in serving as the Vice Chair.

Ms. Shamp nominated Ms. Plummer as the Chair of the HPB.

Ms. Shamp nominated Mr. Kakatsch as the Vice Chair of the HPB.

A. Appointment of members to the Historic Advisory Committee

Community Development Director Fluegel explained the Board was required to appoint the members from the Estero Island Historic Society which they voted the following names to be submitted to the HAC by the Historic Society members: Roxy Smith, A.J. Bassett, Fran Santini, and Linda Meeter.

MOTION: Mr. Kakatsch to approve Roxy Smith, A.J. Bassett, Fran Santini, and Linda Meeter to the HAC; second by Mr. Smith.

VOTE: Motion approved, 7-0.

B. Summary of St. Raphael's Plaque Presentation

Community Development Director Fluegel reported he attended the St. Raphael's plaque presentation ceremony and he noted his observation regarding the uniqueness of the church in the neighborhood.

MOTION: Ms. Kakatsch moved to adjourn the HPB at 12:08 p.m. and reconvene as the LPA; second by Mr. Smith.

VOTE: 7-0.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD ADJOURNED AND RECONVENED AS THE LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY 12:08 P.M.

LPA Member Items and Reports – continued.

Mr. Zuba - no items or reports.

Mr. Kakatsch – complimented the bridge painting concept and reported the posts underneath the bridge looked like they were power washed; however, he noted the bars underneath the bridge on top of the posts were filthy. He asked Community Development Director Fluegel to ask the State if they could clean the bars on top of the posts. He also discussed his observation about the new marina adjacent to the bridge and questioned what would it be.

Community Development Director Fluegel reported the marina in question would be part yacht construction and part boat storage. He explained he heard it would be a 'mega yachting facility' (i.e. repairs and storage and other marina storage elements) and they were not within the incorporated Town

limits. He noted they were approved as an Industrial Planned Development by the County, and he believed that the Notice of Hearing was received by his predecessor.

Mr. Kakatsch questioned the appearance of the beach with respect to the re-nourishing of the beach at the north end and the people who were not permitting the equipment to pass through their property.

Discussion was held concerning the vegetation issues and the easements associated with the project.

Mr. Durrett – no items or reports.

Mr. Van Duzer – no items or reports.

Mr. Smith – no items or reports.

Ms. Plummer –asked, in the future, that if any maps were included in a report that it be placed at the beginning of the document and not at the end. She questioned how many times had the State painted the bridge and who paid for the maintenance.

Community Development Director Fluegel stated it was the State DOT.

Ms. Shamp addressed the LPA proposed meeting schedule (second Tuesday of each month) and mentioned they begin promptly at 9:00 a.m. She explained the LPA was required to have 10 meetings per year, so there were times in the summer they drop the August meeting depending on how busy the LPA was at that point.

X. LPA ATTORNEY ITEMS

No items to report.

XI. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR ITEMS

Director Fluegel – no items or report.

XII. LPA/HPB ACTION ITEM LIST REVIEW& ITEMS FOR NEXT MONTH'S AGENDA

Ms. Shamp noted the Action Item List included in the agenda packet and she explained for the benefit of the new members that this was the LPA resolution list which had been passed but not yet presented to Town Council; and she pointed out the LPA sends a representative to those Council meetings in case the Council had any questions. She asked if there was a date for the Surf Club.

Community Director Fluegel stated the Surf Club was approved.

Ms. Shamp questioned the Holiday Inn sign variance.

Community Director Fluegel reported Holiday Inn withdrew their sign variance application; Connecticut Street was still to be determined; La Ola Restaurant and Diamond Head would go before Council on October 17th.

Ms. Shamp asked if there was an LPA member available, who was on the LPA at the time these two resolutions appeared before the LPA, who would be able to attend the Council meeting.

Mr. Kakatsch stated he would be available to represent the LPA and attend the October 17th Town Council Meeting.

She questioned the status of the resolution which passed today on personal watercraft. LPA Attorney Miller reported the resolution would more than likely be introduced at the first meeting in November, and then adopted at the second meeting in November.

Ms. Shamp reviewed the remainder of the LPA/HPB Action List:

- No continued hearings
- Asked if there was anything new or different on the list
- EAR - remain as TBD
- COP in EC - change the date to next month; Director Fluegel stated staff would more than likely create a draft for discussion purposes
- Beach raking – date of September was incorrect; Director Fluegel stated the date would probably be November, and the staff name should be Mr. Laakkonen

Ms. Shamp announced the next meeting of the Town of Fort Myers Beach LPA would be held on Tuesday, November 8, 2011 at 9:00 a.m.

XIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

No comment.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Motion by Mr. Durrett, seconded by Mr. Smith to adjourn.

VOTE: Motion approved, 7-0.

Meeting adjourned at 12:21 p.m.

Adopted _____ With/Without changes. Motion by _____

Vote: _____

Signature

- End of document.

Lois Poff

From: Ken Miller
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 8:47 AM
To: Lois Poff
Subject: File folders

Lois,

I need file folders for:

MEC11-0181 through 0210

Respectfully,

Ken Miller, CFM
2523 Estero Blvd.
Fort Myers Beach, FL 33931
239-765-0202 X 113
ken@fortmyersbeachfl.gov

We value your opinion and would ask that you take a minute to complete a survey regarding our Customer Service at the following link:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6T2P9DC>

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from Fort Myers Beach officials regarding Town business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may be subject to public disclosure.

Lois Poff

From: Ken Miller
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 1:30 PM
To: Lois Poff
Subject: file folders

Lois,

I need file folders for:

COM11-0271 through 0290 color purple

Respectfully,

Ken Miller, CFM
2523 Estero Blvd.
Fort Myers Beach, FL 33931
239-765-0202 X 113
ken@fortmyersbeachfl.gov

We value your opinion and would ask that you take a minute to complete a survey regarding our Customer Service at the following link:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6T2P9DC>

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from Fort Myers Beach officials regarding Town business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may be subject to public disclosure.