

Scotty L. Kelly

From: jrbrunn@aol.com
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 12:18 PM
To: sancouncil
Subject: Public Comment for August 18 City Council Meeting

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jrbrunn@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact MIS Support.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the debt forgiveness request by CHR that is being considered at the August 18 City Council meeting. If CHR did not spend so much on the ill-conceived Riverview II project, which is still being debated, which I also oppose, they would not have any financial difficulties whatsoever. Whatever their difficulties are, they need to solve them without taxpayer contributions.

I suggest disbanding CHR and outsourcing the management of these properties to property management professionals, of which there are plenty on the Island, thereby saving the city money, and upgrading the quality of housing for the CHR residents.

Respectfully submitted, James Brunn

From: Carolyn Marino <carolynmarino54@gmail.com>

Date: August 17, 2026 at 11:39:40 AM EDT

To: sancouncil@mysanibel.com

Subject: Public Comment for August 18, 2026 City Council Meeting

I am writing today to oppose CHR's request for loan forgiveness which is an agenda item on the August 18, 2026 City Council meeting agenda, and ask City Council to vote against it. In addition, I note several other CHR matters that are currently under discussion, which weigh against debt forgiveness.

Unverified Housing Math: The City and CHR have compelled civic-minded residents to support the 333% density variance for Riverview II by claiming it is required to hit our historic 3% Below Market Rate Housing (BMRH) goal. However, neither entity has publicly disclosed the formula used. Post-Hurricane Ian, our total housing inventory shrank. Independent calculations indicate that Sanibel has already met or exceeded the 3% threshold. Taxpayers deserve to see the official data before being told this massive footprint is a "necessity." The calculation of the current CHR Housing percentage is as follows: 76 CHR units / (6,302 housing units from the Stantec report x 40% full-time residents) x 100 = **3%**. After Riverview I is complete in a few months, the calculation is 76 + 15 CHR units / (6,302 housing units x 40%) x 100 = **3.6%**.

The Guarantor Contradiction: At this City Council meeting, CHR is asking Sanibel taxpayers to wipe away a \$72,713 loan obligation. Simultaneously, the City will have to act as a sub-recipient which makes it a financial guarantor for CHR's \$9.75 million federal grant. If CHR cannot service a minor \$72,713 debt, it exposes an alarming financial strain. If CHR defaults or fails to meet the May 2029 federal deadline, that \$9.75 million grant converts into a local loan that Sanibel taxpayers are legally obligated to repay. At any rate, the substantial expenses incurred by CHR in pursuing Riverview II has been unnecessary because the 3% target has been met. If it had not been incurred, CHR would not need to "significantly ease the financial burden on CHR" as stated by Nicole Mchale in her May 27, 2026 request to City Manager Dana Souza and City Council. Taxpayers should not be held accountable for this expense.

Scope of the Working Group: The upcoming joint working group must not be restricted solely to Lee County's Fair Housing/disparate impact discussion. The two issues raised above should be added to the working group agenda.

City Council has approved Riverview II under the mistaken or false premise that it was necessary to meet the 3% goal, when in fact it was reached even before Riverview 1 was commenced. The project must be reassessed with that realization. Having attained the 3%, Sanibel's overarching mission of preserving nature through resisting development becomes paramount. Some might say that the 3% target for CHR units stated in the Sanibel Plan was a

base number. However, if that was the case, the Plan would have stated it. The Plan is clear, it is not ambiguous, and is to be read at face value. There are good reasons for this. Additional units increase taxes for Sanibel residents, and increase housing density, thereby working against Sanibel's paramount goal of preserving the natural environment.

The working group must conduct a full, transparent audit of CHR's current finances and disclose other City/CHR financial transactions, and also the realistic increase in the annual city contribution to CHR expenses if Riverview II were to be built. The residents of Sanibel are paying attention to this project, having expressed a lot of opposition at the time of the July 21, 2026 City Council meeting, submitting 35 emails either against the project outright, or against if it is not for Sanibel Island workers. This is a surprising number given that snowbirds are generally less informed of current events on Sanibel during the summer.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Marino

August 16, 2026

Sent from my iPad

Scotty L. Kelly

From: leslie brunn <leslie.brunn@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 10:30 AM
To: sancouncil
Subject: CHR and Riverview 1 and 2 projects

Some people who received this message don't often get email from leslie.brunn@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact MIS Support.

Dear City Council,

I understand that CHR is on the agenda asking for forgiveness of \$72,713 of debt for the Riverview 1 project. I strongly oppose this approval as the residents would be shouldering the burden along with the most recent assessment from the Storm Water Management as well as potential requests for the Riverview 2 project. Some residents are still recuperating from Hurricane Ian damage and I do not feel that we should forgive a debt that the CHR should have been managing. Does this mean that overruns are the residents' responsibility going forward?

Additionally, I would like to protest, again, The Riverview 2 Project. Several points are as follows:

1. Not in accordance with the Sanibel Plan. The Plan calls for a 3% goal for CHR housing, and this will happen when Riverview 1 is completed.
2. City Council and CHR look to be creating a housing "project" that is inconsistent with Sanibel's small town and sanctuary feel. It appears that the planning board's testimony at previous meetings has stated that this project does not conform to the appearance requirements. It also does not conform to the CHR housing requirements. If we have a "Sanibel Plan" why are we deviating?
3. Earlier meetings stated that the Riverview projects were for people who WORK on Sanibel. Now there is another deviation?
4. What are these buildings doing to negatively affect the residents surrounding these projects? Definitely destroying their views and potentially property values. Why are these tax paying residents not considered?

I would appreciate a response to my questions from anyone on the council.

Thank you in advance for distributing my concerns.

Sincerely,

Leslie Brunn
678 East Rocks Drive

Scotty L. Kelly

From: amyosborne@wi.rr.com
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 9:26 AM
To: sancouncil
Cc: amyosborne@wi.rr.com
Subject: Council Agenda

Some people who received this message don't often get email from amyosborne@wi.rr.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact MIS Support.

We bought a house on Sanibel in January and absolutely love Sanibel and all of the things that make it unique. We were not considering buying in Florida until my husband remembered that Sanibel has everything we love about Florida and nothing we dislike. This is a general comment to please keep Sanibel the way it is.

Therefore, we have the following input:

1. We actually love to arrive on the island and have people directing traffic. We do not favor a roundabout.
2. Speed limits should be slow, no passing zones are good. Keep us Sanibel.
3. We don't favor forgiveness of the debt. Doing so is spending the money of the taxpayers.
4. We are opposed to flock cameras. One of the things we love about Sanibel is the low crime and the excellent police force. While we very much value safety and security, we do not think those things should come at the expense of our privacy. Therefore, we ask that you strongly consider banning the flock cameras.