From: Scotty L. Kelly

To: Paula N. McMichael; Craig J. Chandler; Kim M. Ruiz; Savannah L. White; Tadric M. Williams; John D. Agnew

Cc: Anna M. Hicks; Vicki L. Smith; Jacklyn A. L"Archevesque

**Subject:** FW: Comments on Living Shoreline Resolution

**Date:** Tuesday, May 13, 2025 5:02:16 PM

Please see comments from Chair Nichols below.

Scotty Lynn Kelly, MMC, CGSP City Clerk City of Sanibel 239-472-3700 Ext. 354 239-472-3065 (Fax) Scotty.Kelly@MySanibel.com www.mysanibel.com

Click the link to visit the website → www.sanibelcleanwater.org

To learn more about Water Quality on Sanibel visit our Website: Sanibel H2O Matters

<u>PLEASE NOTE:</u> Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from the City of Sanibel regarding City business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications, including your email address, may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Paul Nichols <paulanichols777@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 13, 2025 2:23 PM

**To:** Scotty L. Kelly <Scotty.Kelly@mysanibel.com> **Cc:** Paul Nichols <paulanichols777@gmail.com> **Subject:** Comments on Living Shoreline Resolution

## This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

?

Hi Scotty Lynn,

As requested here are my comments on the Resolution 25-14, any questions for me then please let me know or I'd be happy to discuss with planning staff. I know these amendments are not easy and take a lot of effort and brainpower to work out and we all appreciate the job you all do in drafting these!

Overall Comment - Clearly from the LDCR sub committee meeting the majority of commissioners had issues with administrative approval being granted for shoreline stabilization projects on natural bodies of water (B0W). Staff therefore split out human made and natural bodies so that permits on human made BOWs could be issued administratively. I think this has made commissioners study language that they may not have encountered before and hence why they are questioning why are certain constraints and recommendations only applicable to one type of BOW body of water, especially when some of the human made BOWs are also susceptible to tidal

flows. Therefore my first comment/question is do the advantages of splitting out the human made and natural BOWs outweigh the added complexity and possible confusion? The original wording was not split as such and if human-made BOWs are tidal then why split it out? If the answer is because of the human-made lakes then have specific wording for those. What about the Sanibel River and are there other BOWs that are human-made?

For example in 126-99 section (b) you add 3 additional standards for human-made BOWs whereas I could argue that (b)(1) should also be required for natural BOWs. I also don't understand why (b)(2) and (b)(3) could just as easily be applicable standards for natural BOWs.

It could similarly be argued that most of the items in (c) could be applicable to human-made BOWs as some/most? are tidal and suffer the same issues and standards(1) and (3) also name specific BoWs and so don't need to be split out. I would argue that (c)(2), (5), (6) and (7) apply also to human-made BOWs if they are also tidal. This just leaves (c)(4) which relates to the slope and this could just be one standard as in the original 7(a) with differing grades of slope depending on the BOW.

I am also surprised that on (c)(5) we are allowing "clean cement rip-rap, clean cement grids, clean cement pipes" as acceptable materials for the living shoreline. If these are above or even just under the water line they are not an attractive look and resembles construction debris, which it is!

As a formatting note I would be helpful if the graphics, which are excellent and extremely helpful in understanding the words, could actually be embedded within the text in the ordnance to save jumping around trying to find the applicable graphic from an attachment. This will aid applicants once the ordnance is passed.

My final comment in the meeting today was asking about any progress with the "great wall of china" built in the bay beach zone and I know this is a code violation and will remain so after this ordnance is passed so why is it not being discussed with the home owners now? It could be another 3 or 4 months before any of this code is passed. The discussions with the owners could still discuss the forthcoming allowable designs and also add "public comment" to what is being discussed from their experiences.

Hope this helps....?

Thanks and Regards Paul

From: <u>Lyman Welch</u>
To: <u>Anna M. Hicks</u>

Cc:Scotty L. Kelly; Paula N. McMichaelSubject:Re: Comments on Draft LegislationDate:Tuesday, May 20, 2025 3:16:45 PM

Attachments: Outlook-City Seal

## This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

I would like notice to be provided to property owners within a 300 feet radius of a proposed living shoreline project.

Lyman

Sent from **Proton Mail** for iOS

On Tue, May 20, 2025 at 12:13 PM, Anna M. Hicks <anna.hicks@mysanibel.com > wrote:

Good Afternoon All,

As a reminder, comments regarding the draft legislation are due by the end of today.

Scotty Lynn is out of the office, so if you would kindly forward your comments to me, I will be sure the proper parties are able to review.

Thank you,

Anna

## Anna Hicks, CMC, CGSP

City of Sanibel

Deputy City Clerk

800 Dunlop Road

239-472-3700

Anna.Hicks@mysanibel.com

## www.mysanibel.com

communications to or public records available	s a very broad public records law. Most from the City of Sanibel regarding city e to the public and media upon request. Iding your email address, may be subject	business are Your e-mail