



City of Naples

City Council Chamber
735 Eighth Street South
Naples, Florida 34102

City Council Workshop Meeting – April 13, 2026 – 8:31 a.m.

It is noted for the record that all: 1) documentation electronically appended hereto is also contained in the file for this meeting with the City Clerk's Office; and 2) added attachments are referenced in red as "ADDED ATTACHMENT".

1) CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

City Council Members Present

Teresa Heitmann, Mayor (arrived 10:04 a.m.)
Ted Blankenship, Vice Mayor

Berne Barton
Bill Kramer
John Krol
Linda Penniman
Scott Schultz

Staff Present:

Gary Young, City Manager
Erica Martin, Planning Director

Andrew Dickman, Assistant City Attorney
Jessica Rosenberg, Deputy City Clerk
Ali Duran, Executive Assistant

Others Present:

Martin Horneck
Carrie Schuman
Donna Dabney
Sally Petersen
Luke Fredrickson
Gary Hains
John Langley
Garey Cooper
Raymond Petronko
Laura DeJohn
Leigh Ann King
Erin Deady

Christine Fisher
Amelia Vasquez
Neale Montgomery
Jenna Heiderman
Alan Parker
Kathy Curatolo
Erlend Candea
George D'Agostino
Jim Kalvin
Jeff Rogers
Alex Garland
Mark McLean

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Mayor Blankenship led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3) SET AGENDA (add or remove items)

City Manager Gary Young advised that, on April 8, a supplement was issued adding Item 6.G, a discussion of House Bill 4005, City of Naples Airport Authority (HB 4005), to the agenda. He further stated that the item would be heard immediately following Item 6.A, a Comprehensive Plan update.

MOTION by Penniman to SET THE AGENDA, subject to adding Item 6.G; seconded by Kramer and unanimously carried (Barton-yes, Blankenship-yes, Kramer-yes, Krol-yes, Penniman-yes, Schultz-yes, Heitmann-absent).

4) PUBLIC COMMENTS

Martin Horneck expressed opposition to House Bill 4005, City of Naples Airport Authority (HB 4005), stating that it would shift decision-making authority away from City residents. He urged the City Council to represent and advocate for the community's interests. **Carrie Schuman**,

Climate Resilience Advisor with the Conservancy of Southwest Florida, provided comments on the Comprehensive Plan update, expressing support for the proposed resilience element and staff's efforts. She offered recommendations related to permeable surfaces, wastewater management, septic system impacts, and nature-based coastal protections, and encouraged continued implementation and leadership to ensure the Plan's effectiveness. **Donna Dabney** expressed support for the Comprehensive Plan and advocated for increased emphasis on shade trees, recommending the establishment of measurable targets and reduced reliance on palm species to improve canopy coverage and species diversity. **Sally Petersen** expressed support for the Comprehensive Plan and the public engagement process, and encouraged continued community involvement following adoption. She recommended updating neighborhood priority plans, maintaining the project website as an engagement tool, and elevating the City's vision statement within the document.

5) BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

5.A) Interview Six Applicants for the Planning Advisory Board.

Deputy City Clerk Jessica Rosenberg introduced the item regarding interviews for City Council appointment to the Planning Advisory Board (PAB), consisting of one regular member and one alternate member. She noted that Garey Cooper, Sally Petersen and Raymond Petronko were previously interviewed in March and were invited to re-interview by City Council.

Council Members subsequently conducted the interviews with the following applicants: Garey Cooper, Luke Fredrickson; Gary Hains; John Langley, Sally Petersen and Raymond Petronko.

At the conclusion of the interviews, Vice Mayor Blankenship announced that voting and appointments to the PAB would take place on April 15th.

[Agenda Memorandum](#) 

[Garey Cooper Application](#) 

[Luke Fredrickson Application](#) 

[Gary Hains Application](#) 

[John Langley Application](#) 

[Sally Petersen Application](#) 

[Raymond Petronko Application](#) 

[PAB Code Sec. 2-551](#) 

Recess: 9:51 a.m. to 10:04 a.m. It is noted for the record that the same Council Members were present when the meeting reconvened with the addition of Mayor Heitmann who arrived at 10:04 a.m.

6) DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.A) Update on Naples 2045, the Elective Changes to the City of Naples Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Heitmann introduced the item. Laura DeJohn, Director of Planning & Landscape Architecture at Johnson Engineering, presented an overview of the Naples 2045 Comprehensive Plan update, noting the process has been underway for approximately two years and is currently in draft form. She summarized prior public outreach, Planning Advisory Board (PAB) review, and upcoming milestones, including additional PAB review, City Council consideration in June 2026, and final adoption following State review in the fall of 2026.

Director DeJohn explained that the Comprehensive Plan is developed pursuant to Florida Statutes and includes ten required elements, as well as optional elements such as the Vision Element and a newly added Resiliency Element. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan incorporates the City's adopted vision and focuses on key themes including community character, resilience, and management of growth pressures. She also described the Comprehensive Plan's structure, consisting of goals, objectives, policies, and implementation actions to enhance clarity and execution.

Leigh Ann King, Director at Clarion Associates, provided an overview of the Introduction, Vision, Future Land Use, and Housing Elements. She highlighted updates emphasizing implementation, integration of the City's vision, and coordination with the new Resiliency Element. The Future Land Use Element includes policies addressing community character, compatibility, historic preservation, and environmental initiatives such as Florida-friendly landscaping, tree protection, and implementation of the Urban Forest Green Print, she noted.

Regarding housing, Director King explained that the element was largely carried forward, with limited updates to reflect coordination with Collier County, workforce and attainable housing initiatives, and changes in State law, including the Live Local Act. She noted removal of outdated provisions and inclusion of policies supporting partnerships to advance affordable housing.

In response to Council Members' questions, Director King clarified policies within the Future Land Use Element, including Objective FLU-4 ("Green Jewel") and Objective FLU-6 ("Protect Community Character"), noting that these sections combine existing policies with new implementation actions. She also explained the Comprehensive Plan hierarchy, distinguishing between goals, objectives, policies, and actions.

Mayor Heitmann raised questions regarding natural resource policies and mapping. Planning Director Erica Martin clarified that policies were reorganized rather than removed and consolidated into a Coastal Resources Map to avoid outdated mapping, noting that site-specific environmental review would continue during development review.

Council Members discussed neighborhood planning, with Planning Director Martin recommending that such plans remain separate from the Comprehensive Plan to allow more frequent updates.

Council Members emphasized the need for clear definitions and measurable standards to support implementation. Planning Director Martin confirmed that terminology and definitions are being refined and that performance tracking measures will be developed.

Discussion of the Housing Element addressed the distinction between City and joint City-County policies. City Manager Gary Young noted that the City primarily supports County-led housing efforts and cautioned that certain action items may exceed current City capacity. Assistant City Attorney Andrew Dickman advised that the Comprehensive Plan is legally binding and should clearly distinguish County policies from City obligations. Planning Director Martin confirmed that footnotes clarify which policies are informational or County-specific.

Erin Deady, Attorney and Planner at Erin L. Deady, PA, presented the Conservation and Coastal Management Element and the new Resiliency Element. She noted that conservation policies were largely unchanged but updated to incorporate resiliency considerations. She added that the new Resiliency Element consolidates and expands policies addressing sea level rise, flooding, infrastructure resilience, and long-term adaptation, incorporating recent vulnerability assessments and emphasizing coordination, public education, and differentiation between public and private responsibilities.

Christine Fisher, Principal at Johnson Engineering, presented updates to the Public Facilities, Water Resources, and Transportation Elements. She highlighted integration of resiliency into infrastructure planning, updates to stormwater level of service standards, coordination with utilities, and removal of outdated provisions. She also recommended referencing, rather than adopting, certain external plans to maintain flexibility.

Transportation updates included reorganization of policies, alignment of level of service standards with peak season conditions, expanded multimodal considerations, and coordination with State and County agencies. Additional revisions included aviation-related policies addressing land use compatibility and noise contours.

Council Members discussed implementation of Complete Streets policies, infrastructure coordination, and limitations on regulating private utilities. Planning Director Martin noted that the Comprehensive Plan provides guidance, while project-specific decisions remain subject to City Council approval.

Discussion also addressed Clam Bay coordination, with City Manager Young recommending revisions to reflect the City's limited jurisdiction and focus on monitoring and coordination rather than implementation. Council Members expressed general agreement.

Additional elements presented included Parks, Recreation and Open Space; Intergovernmental Coordination; and Concurrency and Capital Improvements. Updates included alignment with the Vision Element, consolidation of level of service standards, strengthened intergovernmental coordination language, and clarification of concurrency provisions. The Property Rights Element remained unchanged aside from formatting updates.

Public Comment: Amelia Vasquez, representing the Collier Building Industry Association, expressed concerns regarding implementation of the Comprehensive Plan, emphasizing the need for objective standards, predictability, and alignment with recent State legislation affecting development regulations. She urged clarity in how policies would be translated into the Land Development Code to avoid increased costs and uncertainty. **Neale Montgomery** also expressed concerns regarding the timing of the Comprehensive Plan update, citing recent State legislation and emphasizing the importance of clear, measurable standards supported by professional data and analysis. **Jenna Heiderman** was not present when called.

Recess: 12:28 p.m. to 1:01 p.m. It is noted for the record that the same Council Members were present when the meeting reconvened.

Planning Director Martin outlined the next steps, including internal review, incorporation of Council direction, PAB transmittal hearing, and subsequent Council and State review prior to adoption.

Council Members emphasized the importance of clear language, alignment with the Land Development Code, and accurate growth projections. Additional discussion addressed airport-related policies, terminology, and compliance with State requirements. Planning Director Martin confirmed that departmental review was complete and incorporated into the draft.

[Agenda Memorandum](#)

[Presentation - Naples2045](#)

[Naples2045 City Council Review Draft](#)

[Naples2045 Public Engagement Summary Report](#)

[Naples2045 Summary of Questionnaire 2 Responses](#)

[Fowler Handout PAB Meeting 3.11.2026](#)

[Consultant's Responses to PAB Comments](#)

[Correspondence - ONA - Comp Plan Letter to Council Final](#)

[Correspondence - HOA Coalition to PAB on Comp Plan March 2026](#)

[Correspondence - Recommended Revisions to the Naples 2045 Comprehensive Plan](#)

[Correspondence - COSWFL Comments on Naples Comp Plan for PAB April 2026](#)

[Proposed draft for airport \(ADDED ATTACHMENT / staff\)](#)

6.G) Discussion on HB 4005 (Supplement 1/Added item).

City Manager Gary Young introduced Item 6.G, noting that the discussion was added in response to recent State actions related to House Bill 4005, City of Naples Airport Authority (HB 4005) and its potential impacts on the Naples Airport Authority (NAA).

Mayor Heitmann stated that, should the legislation take effect, the City would explore available options to protect its Home Rule authority and its ability to manage local assets.

Assistant City Attorney Andrew Dickman explained that, pursuant to Florida Statutes, Chapter 164, the City must initiate a conflict resolution process before pursuing litigation against another governmental entity. He outlined that the process would begin with adoption of a Resolution and could lead to mediation, while not committing the City to litigation.

Council Members discussed potential legal strategies, including the timing of initiating the Chapter 164 process, possible litigation against relevant entities, and the need to evaluate associated costs and the likelihood of success. Questions were raised regarding whether additional parties, including State agencies or the Supervisor of Elections, may need to be included in any legal action.

Council Members also expressed concerns regarding the potential transfer of control over the NAA, including impacts on Home Rule authority, governance, and public safety. Additional discussion addressed the importance of fully evaluating legal, financial, and policy implications prior to proceeding.

Council Member Schultz expressed concerns regarding potential legal action and associated costs, including the possibility of significant expenses and the need to evaluate cost recovery provisions and prevailing party considerations. Assistant City Attorney Dickman clarified that, during the Chapter 164 conflict resolution process, each party bears its own costs, but noted that certain legal actions may allow for recovery of attorney's fees depending on the claims asserted and applicable agreements.

Council Members discussed the potential need to include additional parties in any legal action, including local or State entities, and emphasized the importance of evaluating timing considerations, particularly in relation to the upcoming election cycle deadlines. Council Member Kramer spoke about the importance of assessing the likelihood of success and potential cost recovery.

In response to a question regarding timing, Assistant City Attorney Dickman advised that there would be sufficient time to pursue legal remedies if necessary. He explained that the City must first proceed through the Chapter 164 conflict resolution process, but noted that preparations for potential legal action, including an emergency injunction, could occur concurrently. He stated that the process timeline would still allow the City to seek relief in advance of the November election.

Council Member Krol also expressed concerns regarding the origin of the legislation, questioning how it was introduced by a State representative outside the district and noting that it appears to uniquely impact the Naples Airport. He further raised concerns regarding potential conflicts of interest and suggested that the matter may warrant additional legal or ethics review.

Additional discussion included consideration of alternative legal strategies, including evaluation of existing lease provisions and other available legal remedies. Council Members generally agreed on the importance of proceeding deliberately, fully evaluating legal and financial considerations, and continuing to gather information prior to determining a course of action.

City Manager Young requested a consensus for preparation of the Resolution.

Consensus to direct staff to prepare a Resolution initiating the Chapter 164 conflict resolution process for consideration at the April 15, 2026 meeting.

City Manager Young noted that the Resolution would be presented as a supplemental item, and he clarified that the action would initiate the conflict resolution process only and would not commit the City to litigation at this time. He also advised that, depending on the City Council direction, a future budget amendment may be required to address potential litigation-related expenditures. He also identified potential dates for joint meetings with the NAA and Collier County to facilitate coordination.

Council Member Schultz inquired whether the City's lobbyist also represents other governmental entities, including Collier County. City Manager Young confirmed that the City shares a lobbyist with the County and noted that a separate lobbyist had been retained specifically for airport-related matters. He acknowledged that some overlap in representation exists, particularly for joint funding efforts such as septic-to-sewer projects, and explained that the arrangement reflects historical practices, including prior reliance on the County's lobbying services.

Public Comment: Alan Parker urged the City to pursue legal action challenging the legislation and suggested alternative strategies, including reevaluating the existing lease agreement with the airport.

[Agenda Memorandum \(Supplement 1/Added Attachment\)](#) 

6.B) Discussion of Elevating Nonconforming Residences for Flood Protection.

Planning Director Erica Martin introduced the item, a discussion regarding potential amendments to streamline approval of requests to elevate nonconforming residential structures for flood protection. She utilized an electronic presentation to explain that recent storms resulted in increased requests from property owners to elevate older homes that do not meet current setback requirements, noting that the existing process requires Planning Advisory Board (PAB) review and City Council approval.

Director Martin outlined a potential administrative approval process for cases involving elevation of an existing structure within its current footprint, with only the minimum improvements necessary to achieve Code-compliant access. She noted that any expansion of the nonconforming structure, or improvements beyond minimal egress requirements, would continue to require City Council review.

Council Members discussed the balance between improving resiliency and maintaining neighborhood character. Questions were raised regarding the visual impacts of elevated homes, consistency with surrounding neighborhoods, and whether additional public input should be required for certain designs. Planning Director Martin confirmed that the City does not currently have design standards for single-family homes, limiting the ability to regulate aesthetics, and noted that no complaints had been received regarding previously approved elevated structures.

Council Members generally expressed support for streamlining the process for straightforward elevation requests, while retaining City Council review for proposals involving expansion, enhanced design features, or increased nonconformity.

Kathy Curatolo, Consulting Legislative Liaison at the Collier Building Industry Association, expressed support for elevating structures as an effective method to protect housing while preserving neighborhood character. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that any administrative approval process is clearly defined and easy for property owners to navigate.

Planning Director Martin stated that staff would prepare proposed Land Development Code amendments for review by the PAB, followed by City Council consideration.

[Agenda Memorandum](#) 

[Presentation - Nonconformities](#) 

[Code of Ordinances - Section 46-35](#) 

6.C) Discussion of Dock Regulations Citywide.

Planning Director Erica Martin introduced the item regarding proposed updates to dock regulations, explaining that staff is addressing the issue in phases, beginning with Aqualane Shores and potential reorganization of the Land Development Code. She proposed relocating dock regulations from Chapter 56 (Supplemental Standards) to Chapter 52 (Resource Protection Standards) to consolidate water-related provisions.

Planning Director Martin utilized an electronic presentation to identify regulatory inconsistencies in Aqualane Shores, particularly for properties fronting Naples Bay, where existing standards are

unclear and many docks are nonconforming. She explained that current regulations limit dock projections but do not adequately address open water conditions, creating challenges for enforcement and construction, and may inadvertently encourage dredging to achieve sufficient water depth. She noted that staff has received input from marine industry professionals and environmental staff.

Planning Director Martin presented examples from Port Royal and Royal Harbor and asked Council direction on whether to develop similar standards for Aqualane Shores or pursue an alternative approach.

Council Members discussed the need for consistency across waterfront neighborhoods, impacts on navigation, and balancing property rights with environmental protection. Planning Director Martin confirmed that general standards, including navigation and proportional waterway use, would continue to apply.

Council Member Barton supported consistent standards between Port Royal and Aqualane Shores, while deferring to marine industry expertise. Planning Director Martin explained that Port Royal regulations allow docks to extend beyond 25 feet as necessary to reach a minimum depth of five feet at mean low water, with increased setbacks as length increases. Council Member Krol noted that docks on Naples Bay are constructed over State-owned submerged lands and require State permitting, and discussion included whether submerged land leases may be required in certain situations.

Public Comment: **Erlend Candea** and **George D’Agostino** expressed concern regarding proposed 40-foot dock extensions in narrower waterways in the Coquina Sands neighborhood, noting potential impacts to navigation, neighborhood character, and property values. They asked that the City carefully evaluate the proposal and consider the impacts on existing residents. Naples Marine Contractor, **Jim Kalvin** emphasized the need for clearer guidance, noting challenges when projects are designed and contracted but later deemed unbuildable. He stated that in Port Royal, protrusion limits were recently increased and projects are reviewed in advance by the Port Royal Property Owners Association, resolving many issues prior to City review. In addition, he expressed interest in further engagement on dock and waterfront regulations in Golden Shores and Oyster Bay, citing challenges related to seawalls, canal-adjacent property lines, and unclear construction limits. He emphasized the need for consistent standards and offered his assistance to staff. **Jeff Rogers** of Turrell Hall & Associates, emphasized that dock regulations in Naples are outdated and do not reflect modern vessel sizes, driving demand for larger docks. He noted unique challenges in Aqualane Shores due to State lands and potential submerged land leases, which add complexity, while Port Royal standards generally avoid such issues. He emphasized the need for a citywide Code update, citing ongoing development along Gulf Shore Boulevard North and the importance of docks to property value and tax revenue. He encouraged continued progress and offered his assistance. **Alex Garland** of Garland & Garland Marine Construction, stated that varying waterway conditions create different design constraints, noting that some residential areas allow parallel docking approaches, while areas such as Naples Bay and Park Shore often require boats to be brought in straight, limiting vessel size under current protrusion rules. He explained that Aqualane Shores has deeper water and seawalls, making it more comparable to Royal Harbor than Port Royal, which has shallower riprap conditions requiring longer docks. He questioned whether adopting Port Royal standards would affect the conformity status of existing docks. He added that waterways in Park Shore are wide, noting that a 40-foot protrusion represents a relatively small percentage of overall width compared to allowances elsewhere. He commended staff for their comprehensive approach and consideration of broader conditions.

Concerns were raised by City Council Members regarding vague and inconsistent Code language, particularly provisions relying on undefined “lines of construction,” and the need to develop clearer, more tailored standards reflective of neighborhood characteristics and channel locations.

Council Member Barton emphasized reliance on staff and subject matter experts to develop appropriate Code language, citing the technical nature of dock design and waterway constraints. Discussion also addressed a potential redevelopment site in Aqualane Shores along Naples Bay, noting that approximately three waterfront lots could be eligible for docks under current conditions, while inland lots would not.

Mr. Rogers noted inconsistencies in existing dock conditions throughout the area, explaining that many older docks exceed current Code limits, creating challenges when advising new property owners. He stated that applicants often reference nearby nonconforming docks, leading to confusion when current regulations restrict projections to 25 feet. In addition, Mr. Rogers emphasized the need for clear, consistent standards to guide design and permitting, suggesting that updated regulations should reflect actual conditions, water depth requirements, and vessel needs. He also noted that dock lengths vary significantly based on site conditions, including shallow water areas requiring longer projections.

Council Members emphasized the need for staff to return with proposed Code language developed in coordination with marine industry professionals and other stakeholders to allow for a more informed discussion of potential regulatory updates. Vice Mayor Blankenship requested that staff also engage with the Aqualane Shores Homeowners Association to obtain input during the drafting process.

Council Members expressed general support for relocating dock regulations to Chapter 52 of the Land Development Code.

Planning Director Martin clarified that dock permits are processed administratively as marine permits and are not subject to Design Review Board approval, confirming that review would be conducted by City staff in accordance with existing Code requirements. She further noted that, without a formal submittal, staff could not determine compliance with applicable regulations.

Council Members acknowledged concerns raised by nearby residents regarding limited opportunity for public input, and Planning Director Martin confirmed that those concerns were understandable given the administrative nature of the permitting process.

[Agenda Memorandum](#) 

[Presentation](#) 

[Ordinance - City Council - 2010-12741](#) 

6.D) Discussion of Design Review Board Process.

Planning Director Erica Martin introduced the item regarding potential modifications to the City's development review process, noting that it has been under consideration since 2022 and discussed in prior workshops. She utilized an electronic presentation to outline the current process, including Preliminary Design Review, administrative site plan review, potential Planning Advisory Board (PAB) and City Council approvals, and Final Design Review, and explained that site plan review involves comprehensive interdepartmental coordination for Code compliance.

Planning Director Martin reviewed prior streamlining efforts, including a proposed Ordinance that was approved on first reading but not adopted on second reading. She presented three alternative development review process options, as illustrated in Exhibits A, B, and C. Exhibit A reflected the current review process, including both Preliminary and Final Design Review stages. Exhibit B proposed eliminating the Final Design Review while retaining Preliminary Design Review. Exhibit C proposed eliminating the Preliminary Design Review while retaining Final Design Review. She requested City Council direction on which approach to pursue.

Mayor Heitmann expressed concern regarding confusion in the development review process, particularly related to what is approved at each stage, and emphasized the need for clarity, transparency, and public understanding.

Council Members discussed the role of the Design Review Board (DRB) and the balance between administrative efficiency and City Council oversight. Planning Director Martin clarified that the DRB reviews architectural and design standards, while administrative site plan review addresses zoning, infrastructure, and Code compliance.

Council Member Kramer supported maintaining early DRB involvement to improve project quality and reduce delays. Council Member Barton emphasized that Code-compliant projects should proceed administratively and that concerns regarding development outcomes should be addressed through Land Development Code amendments. Council Member Penniman supported eliminating the Final Design Review hearing to improve efficiency.

Assistant City Attorney Andrew Dickman provided legal perspective regarding the development review process, noting that consolidating review into a single quasi-judicial hearing is preferable, as the official record is established during that proceeding. He explained that multiple hearings can create ambiguity as to whether a matter is a continuation or a separate proceeding. He further clarified that project approvals may be conditioned upon obtaining related entitlements, such as variances or conditional use permits. If such approvals are not granted, he added, applicants would be required to revise their design and return for further review, consistent with standard site plan procedures.

Council Member Schultz referenced a prior DRB agenda item to better understand how projects progress through the development review process. He questioned whether certain projects reviewed by the DRB may not advance to the Planning Advisory Board (PAB) or the City Council. Planning Director Martin explained that all projects begin with DRB review. If an applicant elects to proceed, the project then advances through administrative site plan review and, where applicable, to the PAB and the City Council based on established criteria in the Land Development Code. She clarified that projects are not “short-stopped” by discretion but instead follow defined triggers in the Code that determine whether additional review is required. It was further noted that the DRB may review a broader range of preliminary concepts, some of which do not advance further if the applicant chooses not to proceed.

Council Member Krol expressed concern that large-scale developments may not receive sufficient public visibility under the current process and suggested evaluating additional review thresholds. Planning Director Martin confirmed that public input opportunities exist during DRB hearings and through required notices.

Council Members discussed limitations of the current process in addressing neighborhood compatibility, including building massing, parking structures, and visual impacts, noting that such concerns may require updates to the Land Development Code.

Vice Mayor Blankenship recalled that City Council previously adopted an Ordinance requiring new development or redevelopment above a specified square footage threshold to be reviewed by the PAB and the City Council to ensure public participation. He noted that implementation of that requirement was affected by Senate Bill 180 (SB180). He suggested that, within those constraints, the City may consider relying on its review procedures to maintain multiple levels of review and public input.

Council Member Schultz expressed concern regarding the potential cumulative impact of large-scale residential development along the waterfront, noting that multiple adjacent properties could create continuous building mass that limits public vistas and views of the coastline. He emphasized the importance of preserving visual access to natural features, which contribute to the City’s character and quality of life. Assistant City Attorney Dickman advised that, under current law, residents do not have inherent rights to air, light, or views unless such protections are established through adopted regulations. He noted that view corridors and similar protections must be explicitly incorporated into the City’s Code or Comprehensive Plan to be enforceable.

Planning Director Martin explained that existing regulations address building mass through dimensional standards, including maximum building width and height-based setback requirements, which increase as building height increases. Council Member Schultz requested that staff explore incorporating stronger policy language related to view corridor and vista protection within the Comprehensive Plan, with the understanding that any such policy would require corresponding Code amendments for implementation.

Public comment: Amelia Vasquez, representing the Collier Building Industry Association, stated that its members encouraged focusing less on the number of hearings and more on ensuring decisions are clear, final, and binding. She expressed concern regarding late-stage design changes, lack of clarity between review stages, and design decisions shifting into the permitting phase, noting these issues can delay projects and increase costs. She supported streamlining efforts, provided they improve predictability and do not shift unresolved issues to later stages of the review process. She offered to continue working with staff and City Council and to provide additional recommendations. Mayor Heitmann asked for follow-up information outlining coordination issues and potential improvements. **Mark McLean**, Architect at MHK Architecture, offered to serve as a resource on development-related topics, noting ongoing coordination with staff and prior engagement with Council Members. He stated that the DRB process is functioning as intended, citing examples where projects were modified to address concerns, including adjustments to building placement, landscaping, and design features. He noted that additional refinements often occur during construction and coordination with staff. He emphasized the importance of maintaining the initial DRB review, explaining that early feedback allows staff to verify compliance with design-related comments throughout the process. Architect McLean also noted that the City lacks a streamlined mechanism to amend the Land Development Code, stating that the current process is complex and time-intensive compared to other jurisdictions. He expressed concern regarding the length of the review process, explaining that projects may take 14 to 16 months to reach permitting, with additional delays caused by sequential reviews, repeated departmental comments, and revisions triggered at later stages. He suggested that allowing certain reviews to occur concurrently could reduce timelines while maintaining oversight, and emphasized that improving efficiency, not restructuring the process itself, should be the primary focus. **Kathy Curatolo** was not present when called.

Planning Director Martin acknowledged that the site plan review process has become increasingly detailed and time-intensive, contributing to longer timelines, and noted that interdepartmental review requirements have expanded beyond the original intent. Council Members expressed general support for refining the development review process to improve efficiency while maintaining appropriate oversight, with an emphasis on clarity and early DRB involvement.

Architect McLean indicated that while the Zoning Code is generally effective, targeted updates are needed, including clearer standards and mechanisms for amendments. He also noted the need to address underground parking impacts, streamline the approval process, and consider restoring controlled deviations to allow design flexibility while maintaining City Council oversight.

Planning Director Martin confirmed that staff would return with proposed amendments consistent with Exhibit B. Council Members also emphasized the importance of aligning the Comprehensive Plan with the Land Development Code to ensure effective implementation of policy direction.

[Agenda Memorandum](#)

[Exhibits A B and C - Planning Department Project Flow Charts](#)

[Ordinance 2025-15753 - First Reading 10-1-2025](#)

[DRAFT Ordinance Boards and Committees - Second Reading 10-15-2025](#)

6.E) Discussion of Generator and Mechanical Equipment Regulations.

City Manager Gary Young requested that the item be continued to either the May 20th Regular City Council Meeting, or the June 15th City Council Workshop.

Vice Mayor Blankenship expressed concern regarding delaying discussions on proposed generator regulations relative to the upcoming hurricane season, noting the importance of ensuring residents can obtain and install generators in a timely manner.

Planning Director Erica Martin responded that staff had researched the issue extensively and found it to be complex, involving Building Code requirements and manufacturer specifications. She indicated that while some improvements may be possible, a comprehensive solution may not address all situations. She further advised that an existing variance process remains available for residents seeking generator installations, and noted that portable generators may be used at any time without City approval. She added that potential Code amendments would likely require additional time for review and adoption.

Council Members discussed scheduling considerations, including the possibility of a future workshop dedicated to generator-related issues, and emphasized the importance of communicating available options to the public.

[Agenda Memorandum](#)

[Presentation](#)

[Code of Ordinances - Section 56-41](#)

6.F) Discussion on increasing Building Department Building Permitting Fees for the purpose of Cost recovery.

City Manager Gary Young requested that the item be continued to the May 6, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting or the next Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Workshop.

[DRAFT Agenda Memorandum](#)

[DRAFT Base Fee Adjustment Ordinance](#)

[FY24 to FY26 Compared](#)

[Naples Fee Comparison Excel Version](#)

[Naples Fee Comparison PDF Version](#)

[Recent Collier County Fee Increases](#)

[Marco SF Home Example](#)

[Collier SF Home Example](#)

7) PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

8) COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND STAFF

Council Member Krol commented on the Comprehensive Plan discussion, noting the complexity of the effort, and expressed concern regarding pending House Bill 4005, City of Naples Airport Authority (HB4005) affecting the Naples Airport, emphasizing the need for the City to advocate for its residents.

Council Member Kramer referenced his participation in a Holocaust remembrance event, reflecting on the significance of survivor testimonies and the importance of continued awareness and education.

Council Member Schultz raised concerns regarding an unpermitted coffee shop operation at Pettit Square. City Manager Gary Young confirmed that a notice of violation had been issued and that the matter was being addressed through Code enforcement and coordination with the City Attorney's Office. City Manager Young further discussed potential Land Development Code amendments to address similar situations in the future, suggesting that certain uses, such as fitness facilities, could be limited to specific zoning districts or require conditional use approval.

Consensus to direct staff to return with proposed Land Development Code amendments to define and regulate fitness-related uses, including consideration of limiting such uses to heavy commercial districts or requiring conditional use approval in other districts.

Council Member Schultz also shared observations from a police ride-along, commending law enforcement personnel. He also noted progress on the Naples Grande water park project and a forthcoming Pelican Bay Services Division (PBSD) meeting, stating he would provide an update.

Council Members continued discussions regarding uses within the Pettit Square development, including noise and compatibility impacts. Planning Director Erica Martin explained that the property is located in a commercial zoning district where uses are permitted by right, and that staff applied the Land Development Code accordingly. She noted that only the residential component requires conditional use approval.

Council Members acknowledged that Code compliance and neighborhood impacts may both exist and discussed potential Code amendments to address compatibility concerns. City Manager Young clarified that deed restrictions are privately enforced, and that amplified music is regulated under noise standards, while live entertainment requires separate approval.

9) ADJOURNMENT

5:41 p.m.

Teresa Lee Heitmann, Mayor

Patricia L. Rambosk, City Clerk

Meeting clerked by:

Jessica R. Rosenberg, Deputy City Clerk

Minutes prepared by:
David Horton

Minutes Approved: 5/6/2026.