



# City of Naples

City Council Chambers  
735 Eighth Street South  
Naples, Florida 33940

-SUBJECT-	Page
PRESENTATION OF ANNUAL REPORT BY PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD.	1-5
DISCUSSION CONCERNING THE CITY'S POLICY OF CHARGING LAND OWNERS FOR VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAYS.	5-7
UPDATE ON ANNEXATION ISSUES.	7-10
DISCUSSION FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CONSTRUCTION PLANS FOR THE EASTERN COLLIER COUNTY AREA.	10-11
PRESENTATION OF PROGRAM BUDGETING: Community Development Department Community Services Department	11-12
DISCUSSION REGARDING PURCHASE OF A SITE FOR THE 5-MILLION GALLON WATER STORAGE TANK.	12-13



Time 9:00 a.m.

Date 1/28/87

Mayor Putzell called the meeting to order and presided as Chairman:

PRESENT: Edwin J. Putzell, Jr.  
 Mayor  
 Kim Anderson-McDonald  
 William E. Barnett\*  
 William F. Bledsoe  
 Alden R. Crawford, Jr.  
 John T. Graver  
 Lyle S. Richardson  
 Councilmen

\*Arrived at 10:05 a.m.

ALSO PRESENT:

Franklin C. Jones, City Manager  
 Mark W. Wiltsie, Assistant City Manager  
 Tara A. Norman, Administrative Assistant  
 Roger J. Barry, Community Services  
 Director  
 Jon C. Staiger, Ph.D., Natural  
 Resources Manager  
 Gerald L. Gronvold, City Engineer  
 Christopher L. Holley, Community  
 Services Director  
 David W. Rynders, City Attorney  
 Norris C. Ijams, Fire Chief  
 Stewart K. Unangst, Purchasing Agent  
 R. Scott, Cameron, Realtor  
 George Henderson, Naples Police  
 Volunteer Corps  
 James Jones, North Naples Fire Chief  
 Parks & Recreation Advisory Board:  
 Robert Smith, Chairman  
 Joan Vega  
 Willie Anthony  
 Jack Portman  
 Charles Andrews  
 Harry Rothchild  
 Alan Korest  
 Herb Anderson  
 Werner Haardt

Marty Bonvechio, Naples Daily News  
 Bill Upham, Naples Times

Called to order 9:05 a.m.

Mayor Putzell advised that this meeting was a regular workshop for discussion of current items by the Council and staff, there being five items for consideration at this meeting.

PRESENTATION OF ANNUAL REPORT BY ITEM 1  
 PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD.

Board Chairman Robert Smith reviewed the report (Attachment #1) which included previous year activities and recommendations for the coming year.

COUNCIL MEMBERS	M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
			Y E S	N O	

COUNCIL MEMBERS	MOTION	SECTION	VOTE		ABSENT
			YES	NO	

On Item #4 - 1986 projects, Council clarified that the location of the Fleischmann Park practice ballfield is north of Lake Park Elementary School.

\* \* \* \* \*

Councilman Anderson-McDonald recommended that the City's risk exposure be carefully researched if the multi-passenger van were purchased for use in transporting groups to recreational programs (Item 1 - new programs). She asked for an opinion from the City Attorney.

Community Services Director Holley explained that school buses are currently leased to take youngsters in the City's programs both for long distances and cross-town trips, and the van would be used for small groups in order to save leasing costs. It would also double as a staff vehicle and eliminate the need for the automobile now used for that purpose. School buses would continue to be used for longer trips; there are 12 to 15 programs per year when a van would be needed. Ms. Anderson-McDonald, however, pointed out that in light of possible liability, utilizing school buses insured by the school system might continue to be the best option.

City Manager Jones assured the Council that the City's insurance consultant would research this matter before a vehicle is purchased. He also noted that the City's insurance carrier usually underwrites items as long as they are regular municipal type activities, frequently without additional charge.

Mr. Graver received clarification from Mr. Holley that only one stop would be made at a central location to pick up passengers and that one stop would be made at the location of the program.

\* \* \* \* \*

With reference to relocation of the old restrooms at the Cambier Park tennis courts (Item #2 - new programs), it was established that to include this work in the current Cambier Community Center renovation project would entail seeking additional funding. Mr. Jones said, however, that a cost estimate could be provided for Council's further consideration.

\* \* \* \* \*

Regarding the long-range master plan for parks (Item 4 - new programs), Mr. Holley said that this would be a worthwhile exercise, despite the fact that the City is almost entirely built out. This review would indicate locations where parks and recreation facilities would be desirable, especially in light of possible annexation. Although the comprehensive plan goes a long way to providing this information, Mr. Holley said, this park master plan would be useful input in the comprehensive planning process. The Board was also planning to review the comprehensive plan, he added.

Mayor Putzell said he believed it to be the consensus of Council that the staff draft this

COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M  
O  
T  
I  
O  
N

S  
E  
C  
O  
N  
D

VOTE  
Y  
E  
S  
N  
O

A  
B  
S  
E  
N  
T

master plan, that the Board provide input, and that the Council consider it in conjunction with the overall City comprehensive plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

With reference to the Board's suggestion that communication with the Council be improved (Item 5 - new programs), Mayor Putzell requested more specific recommendations on programs and projects from the Board for the Council to consider.

Board member Joan Vega explained that because the City seeks to implement recreational programs that are self-supporting, the Board is frequently reluctant to propose any which it feels are important for the community but which participants may not be able to afford to underwrite.

City Manager Jones said that the Board's input on these programs would be especially appropriate now in light of the program budget concept being implemented, and Mayor Putzell confirmed that such suggestions would be welcomed by the Council. Although implementation of programs recommended by the Board could not be open-ended, Mayor Putzell added, the Council would take all of them under advisement.

Another effort to improve communications between the two groups, Board Chairman Smith stated, is the Board's invitation to the Council to participate in park tours; Mayor Putzell said that the Council would be glad to attend.

Board members and the Council then discussed other areas for Board input including recommendations for additional parks and recreation programs. Mr. Smith mentioned the community swimming pool concept and Mayor Putzell advised that discussions with several community groups were taking place. While this is a very ambitious project, it is a very desirable one, Mayor Putzell added, and asked for continued input on this subject.

Mayor Putzell explained further that there were some state funds available if the pool were located on school grounds.

Councilman Richardson stated that expansion of Anthony Park and new neighborhood parks should be included in the park master plan. Mayor Putzell also mentioned the need for more mini-parks and said that the Board's assistance in bringing this about would be very valuable to the Council.

"If we don't move now, it will become more and more difficult to provide green space," he said, and noted the need for community involvement and input in this process as well.

The discussion of areas for new parks continued with suggestions from Councilmen Graver and Anderson-McDonald that the eastern area of the community and small pieces of City-owned land in the Coquina Sands area might be utilized.

Mayor Putzell also suggested a need for parks in the "lake district" north of Seventh Avenue North

COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M  
O  
T  
I  
O  
N

S  
E  
C  
O  
N  
D

VOTE  
Y  
E  
S

N  
O

A  
B  
S  
E  
N  
T

and East of U.S. 41. Mr. Bledsoe also pointed out that not every City park need be inside the city limits, such as possible use of sites like the one to be purchased for a new water storage tank.

Mrs. Vega reiterated, however, that she saw the greatest need for parks for children, both passive and active. Mayor Putzell again stressed the need to consider all these elements in the master plan.

Mrs. Vega also said the City should look for land north of the city limits prior to annexation because land costs accelerate afterward.

Board member Willie Anthony expressed the opinion that the Council discussion had not yet fully addressed the problems being experienced by the Board in connection with its duties and responsibilities. It is difficult for Board members to know where the bounds of their duties lie in connection with input on the day-to-day operations of the Community Services Department, he said, and when they can make recommendations to the staff without being perceived as making directives. The Board needs an understanding that free discussion can be held without stepping over its lines of authority and responsibility. The Board's recommendations just presented to the Council were less than complete, he said, in large measure because of this concern.

Mr. Crawford cited the ordinance provisions which outline the Board's duties in making recommendations.

Mr. Anthony then contrasted the limitations of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board with the Planning Advisory Board (PAB). One runs smoothly and the other has difficulties; the PAB members are encouraged to be innovative and express their feelings and the same should apply to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board, he contended.

City Manager Jones noted that comparing these two groups is difficult because the PAB is required to review issues coming before the Council for action and does not have input on expenditure of resources or utilization of personnel. The Parks & Recreation Advisory Board, on the other hand, is dealing with an operational unit of the City when making recommendations and, under the Charter, the management of these resources is the purview of the chief executive officer (the City Manager). The role of the advisory board is solely to make recommendations to the Council and the enabling ordinance sought to put those suggestions by the Board into the process at the most timely place, a year in advance of implementation which sets them aside from the actual operation, Mr. Jones explained.

Once the Council has adopted the capital improvement program, comprehensive plan, operating budget, etc., it becomes the responsibility of the staff to carry it out, Mr. Jones continued, although he said he understood that Board members often feel frustrated that these plans, as approved by Council, do not always take the form which they originally recommended.

COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
		Y E S	N O	

Mayor Putzell asked if Board recommendations were made directly to Council or were filtered through the staff. Community Services Director Holley said that recommendations come either in the form of Board minutes or in a separate memo directly to the Mayor and Council. Mr. Crawford reminded the group that because the Council is responsible for funding recommendations, all Board projects cannot necessarily be implemented. Exceptions, however, during the budget year may be implemented upon the Board's request if funding could be transferred from some other project, he added.

Mr. Anthony also cited projects which are presented to the Board after plans were firm and using the Board for this purpose is not what is intended, he added. Mayor Putzell said that the Council should have been more sensitive and anticipated that the Board should have been involved more at an earlier stage. After the election, however, he explained, the Council had wanted to get off to a fast start on various projects. He promised to invite Board members to attend further Council discussions of these issues. Mayor Putzell said that he perceived Mr. Anthony's concern to be more involving contact with the staff. He said he felt the Council understood these problems and that things would work more smoothly in the future.

Mayor Putzell also recommended that the Board provide Council copies of memoranda which go to the the staff as well as other recommendations, including items over and above their annual report.

Mr. Graver asked also for more specific cost estimates on various projects recommended by the Board for the coming year.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mrs. Vega then mentioned the need for appointment of two members to the Board and Mayor Putzell said that this action had been deferred pending today's discussion. He said he had, in fact, interviewed another applicant the day before and assured her that the appointments would now take place promptly. He thanked the Board for its interest and support.

ITEM 2

DISCUSSION CONCERNING THE CITY'S POLICY OF CHARGING LAND OWNERS FOR VACATION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY. REQUESTED BY MAYOR PUTZELL.

Mayor Putzell stated that this issue was recently raised by Councilman Graver in connection with vacating roadway on South Gordon Drive. Mr. Graver stated that it was brought to his attention by citizen Harry Rothchild who had studied the issue and that the City is one of the few jurisdictions which charges for the vacation of land. The City receives the dedication of the property for provision of alleys or roads but never really has ownership of that land, Mr. Graver added.

COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
		Y E S	N O	

In vacation proceedings, Mr. Graver said, although adjacent property owners receive the land for their own use, most jurisdictions do not charge. The City, in fact, actually receives a benefit for vacation of this property, Mr. Graver pointed out, because when vacated the City no longer has an obligation to pave and/or maintain that particular right-of-way. The question is, he said, whether the City really wants to have a practice of charging for land that it does not specifically own. Careful consideration should be given to possible future need for the property, however, so that it would not have to be repurchased later and it was therefore Mr. Graver's contention that the City does not have the privilege of vacating the land if there is any future potential need.

Although Circuit Court Judge Hayes has concurred with the City Attorney's opinion that the City can charge for vacated land, most other legal authorities do not, Mr. Graver said; when there is no future need for a right-of-way, it should be transferred without charge to the adjacent property owners, he added.

Mr. Bledsoe contended, however, that any land the City vacates does not belong exclusively to the contiguous property owners but to all the citizens of the City of Naples and compensation should therefore be made to all the citizens. The land proposed for vacation at the end of Gordon Drive, for example, could be used for access of heavy equipment which may be required for beach maintenance, he said.

Mr. Crawford asked how the value of vacated land is determined. City Attorney Rynders responded that because the City recognizes that its interest is only a portion of the actual value, the price is usually quite low. Formal appraisals are invited, he said, although this cost is frequently prohibitive in relation to the price of the property involved. He said that his research has found that the City of Boca Raton has a policy similar to the City of Naples and one is being considered by Jacksonville; North Miami Beach did in the past also have this type of policy.

Mr. Rynders further explained that State Statutes provide home rule powers which allow cities to vacate land, subject to the conditions which they impose. This is the language on which the Naples policy is based. The Circuit Court of the 20th Judicial District, which is responsible for legal determinations in this area, was asked to examine this policy, Mr. Rynders explained, and the Court issued a declaratory degree that charging was appropriate. This is, after all, a question of policy, he said, and the Council could decide at any time to reverse it.

(Councilman Barnett arrived at 10:05)

Mr. Crawford said that, philosophically, he felt there should be some compensation to the City and Mayor Putzell said that there is also a principle involved, not just a dollar amount.

COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
		Y E S	N O	

Councilman Anderson-McDonald called for a consensus on the issue. She said further that each case should be judged on its merits; either charge or not charge and agree with the property owner so that rights to the property revert to the City if the property is needed.

Mr. Richardson recommended continuing the present policy, as did Mr. Barnett who said because of the infrequent requests, it is not a significant item.

Mayor Putzell called on citizen Harry Rothchild who had requested to speak and asked him to restrict his comments to the policy issue, which was the only item now before the Council.

Mr. Rothchild cited his legal research that municipalities do not have the right to compensation for vacating land they do not own and that it is not permissible to charge for vacating rights-of-way no longer needed for public purposes.

He also said his research among the cities of Fort Myers, Bradenton, Sarasota and North Miami as well as Pinellas and Pasco Counties indicated that none require compensation. Two previous Naples City Attorneys (Charles Allan and John Fletcher) had also indicated that compensation should not be required, Mr. Rothchild added.

He then cited various private attorneys who had appeared before the Council resisting the policy of paying for vacations. In conclusion, Mr. Rothchild recommended that the Council reverse its current policy.

Mr. Graver asked for the Mayor Putzell's comments. Mayor Putzell responded that the Circuit Court decision is binding law on the City, the City Attorney had made his recommendation, and unless there is substantial reason to deviate, the Council should follow these determinations. He said he did not feel that the policy is illegal, particularly because of the language of the Florida Statutes. Until the Circuit Court decision is overturned, this is the law in the 20th district, he added.

Mayor Putzell declared it to be the sense of at least a majority of the Council members that the current policy be continued.

ITEM 3

UPDATE ON ANNEXATION ISSUES. REQUESTED BY CITY MANAGER.

City Manager Jones advised that interviews on the subject were held with individual Council members with the goal of establishing a policy on annexation. Today's discussion was to discuss in general terms the issue of annexation and under what conditions areas might be considered for annexation. Then the specific issues to be addressed in an annexation policy as well as a time frame for annexation would be outlined.



COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M  
O  
T  
I  
O  
N

S  
E  
C  
O  
N  
D

Y  
E  
S

N  
O

A  
B  
S  
E  
N  
T

VOTE

A map Mr. Jones displayed showed all areas suggested by individual Council members, regardless of whether the areas were favored by all. (A copy of this map is on file in the City Clerk's office.) Colors identified areas which might be voluntarily annexed and those for which it might be necessary to pursue involuntary annexation due to the degree of development and the number of individual owners involved.

The areas proposed for annexation will eventually be based on Council policy, he added, but the City could conceivably annex all areas to which the City provides or would be required to provide urban services.

Coordination with jurisdictions now providing these various services would, of course, be necessary, Mr. Jones added. Outside the City fire services, for example, are provided by independent districts and the impact thereon varies depending upon population, location of present fire facilities, etc. None of these issues are insurmountable, he said, but it would take an effort to coordinate with those particular districts.

Currently the sheriff has county-wide responsibility, Mr. Jones continued, although under the City-County double taxation agreement, certain of the sheriff's services to residents of the City were excluded from funding. The shift from County to City would cause the City to assume more responsibility with an easing of the sheriff's duties to enable him to devote those resources where needed elsewhere.

In park development, most proposed county parks are sufficiently removed from the City as not to be impacted by annexing areas. Water and sewer services would not be impacted, either, he said, because proposed areas for annexation are already those which are either served now or which it is the City's obligation to serve in the future.

Various other service delivery areas are covered by the double taxation agreement so they are not currently being funded by incorporated area residents, Mr. Jones stated, although there would still be a requirement for coordination with the County. Those County resources devoted to the annexed areas would, however, most likely be needed elsewhere in the County, so this would not cause a need to reduce County staffing.

As far as cost to the City for annexed areas, streets and traffic control are the most serious issues to be addressed, Mr. Jones explained. An analysis would have to be done to determine the cost of improvements in order to bring streets up to city standards and how this cost would be borne -- either through gradual capital improvement or by assessment district.

The general concept would most likely be that the area to be annexed would be determined by the water and sewer service area, he added. Because voluntary annexation is the simplest and least

COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
		Y E S	N O	

costly, those areas could be pursued first; with reference to involuntary annexation, the required elections could be coordinated with already scheduled elections to reduce costs.

Mr. Jones recommended that the service needs of each area be balanced against costs and benefits which would accrue to the City through annexation of that area. Intangibles to be considered include preserving green spaces and having a greater role in the development of these areas.

Timing for voluntary annexation, he said, could follow the interest indicated by property owners; on involuntary annexation, 1988 would be the earliest election for this to be considered. For the duration of 1987, therefore, efforts should be spent on voluntary annexation and developing strategies for those areas which require votes. In 1988 involuntary annexation should be pursued for the fall election, Mr. Jones concluded.

In response to questions about the property tax considerations of annexation to the City, Mr. Jones called attention to County publications he supplied which indicate that the ad valorem tax burden is lower in the City than in practically every other area in the County. (Copies of these items are on file in the City Clerk's Office.) This is primarily due to the double taxation settlement which requires the County to raise revenues for areas which receive various services, he said. Utility and franchise taxes in the City are higher, but weighed against the City ad valorem taxes, it all evens out, he explained.

Mayor Putzell commended Mr. Jones on the completeness of his summary and asked the Council to keep comments to the general issue of annexation.

In response to Mr. Barnett, Mr. Jones said that the staff would now assimilate all data obtained from other jurisdictions, and with Council's judgement of priorities, the staff might find it necessary to come back with a request for additional personnel to provide their recommendations to the Council in a timely manner. The staff's input will include a suggested policy on annexation as well as long term goals and cost/benefit analyses for the City and the areas to be annexed.

Mayor Putzell said that he was very much concerned about the strip of County land along North U.S. 41 which will now permit up to a ten story building and it would be a great shock, he said, to see that type of development occur in contrast to the more restrictive height regulations in the City. The public should be made aware that this could occur. He recommended, therefore, that a priority be to provide a sufficient annexed area on the east side of the street to give a consistent appearance with buildings on the west side of U.S. 41.

This area would be the most difficult to annex, Mr. Jones pointed out, because it would be involuntary.

COUNCIL MEMBERS	M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
			Y E S	N O	

Mr. Crawford suggested that the staff research whether annexing in smaller segments such as from Creech Road to Solana and then north of Solana Road might be advantageous. One portion is largely residential, he added, while the other is primarily commercial. In both areas, 100 foot building heights are permitted under County regulations.

Mr. Graver suggested, however, taking in a larger area might make the vote to annex more favorable than limiting it to the commercial properties which might not be interested because of lower City building heights. Mr. Bledsoe agreed that this could provide a better chance for annexation and also pointed out that although height restrictions might be a negative point, it could be offset by the increased value associated with the property being within the City.

Councilman Richardson said that while the Council should continue to pursue annexation, the County should be advised of the City's desire that City-like height and sign regulations be imposed in these areas. If this is the sense of the community, he said, the County should be asked to take action now to protect the interests of the City. Mayor Putzell said he would bring this up at a planned visit to the County offices that afternoon.

Councilman Crawford said that it should also be recognized that annexation most likely would not be cost effective in some areas because of the need to raise standards and improve facilities. He recommended that it be made known to the public that annexation is for the long term good of the community and there is a price involved.

Mr. Crawford additionally suggested including property west of U.S. 41 across from and north of Solana Road and Mayor Putzell recommended including in the staff study the Seagate School property and the adjacent church because of its wide spread use by City residents.

Mr. Jones thanked the Council for its direction and advised that in three to four weeks the staff would bring back a recommended strategy and analyses of the makeup of the areas to be considered for annexation. Mr. Bledsoe suggested hiring a specialist on municipal annexation to assist the City Manager; Mr. Jones said that this might be necessary in light of the time frame involved and he would include that in his recommendation as well.

ITEM 4

DISCUSSION OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CONSTRUCTION PLANS FOR THE EASTERN COLLIER COUNTY AREA. REQUESTED BY COUNCILMAN RICHARDSON.

Mr. Richardson noted the current visit to the community by Florida Department of Transportation (DOT) representatives to explain how Collier County will be placed in the Bartow District rather than under the jurisdiction of the Fort Lauderdale office to better address this area's needs. It was feared that this could result in

COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
		Y E S	N O	

reduced state road funding for the County, so the DOT had promised to furnish the County and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) a funding history as well as planning outline for the next ten years to determine if, in fact, the County is receiving its fair share and would in the future, he said.

Another concern expressed is whether the State would reduce funding if the County contributes toward projects to expedite them; the DOT is expected to furnish a policy statement denying this, Mr. Richardson explained. From US 41 to Marco Island, for example, the County is purchasing State Road 951 right-of-way which is a contribution toward four-laning, and the City's automation of traffic signals is its contribution, he said. In addition, the County has contributed toward funding of Davis Blvd. four-laning.

The DOT office in Fort Myers will be expanded when Collier County is placed in that jurisdiction and duties are taken over from the Fort Lauderdale office. Councilman Richardson predicted that there would be a good relationship between this Fort Myers office staff and the City Council.

Mr. Richardson then cited recent traffic counts on major north-south highways indicating that traffic had eased on US 41 in the City by construction of I-75 and other north-south county roads.

He also cited DOT's five-year project plan and pointed out the inclusion of funding for six-laning of US 41 from Solana Road to Pine Ridge Road in the 1988-89 season, primarily due to the City's decision to six-lane the southerly section of that highway. "If you work with these people, good things happen," he added. (A copy of the five-year project plan is on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Richardson also noted the Barr Dunlop study of the four corners area which recommended that left turn lanes be restricted and he recommended seeking approval from the DOT to pursue this on a trial basis beginning March 1.

Mayor Putzell asked about a proposed I-75 interchange at Golden Gate Parkway and City Engineer Gronvold said that this work now appears in the DOT funding recommendations.

ITEM 5

PRESENTATION OF PROGRAM BUDGETING:

- A) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
- B) COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Community Development Director Barry stated that his department's two divisions and their activities were broken down into operation and administration on the program budget exhibit presented to the Council (Attachment #2). He reviewed the various sections of required and discretionary programs.

The Community Development Department is generally oriented toward required programs, Mr. Barry commented, and discretionary programs are usually undertaken on an as-needed basis.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
		Y E S	N O	

Mayor Putzell said he was concerned that annexation and the R/UDAT (Regional Urban Design Assistance Team) were considered discretionary because of the importance of these two efforts. Mr. Barry explained that they were listed as discretionary because they were not statutory required activities but assured him that each project's schedule would be adhered to.

(Mayor Putzell left the meeting at 11:25 a.m.)

Community Services Director Holley reviewed his program budget report (Attachment #3) and explained why functions were divided as they were.

He cited annual meetings with property owner associations to keep these channels of communication open. He also noted progress to date on the City Dock expansion, which is on schedule, and the expansion of Lowdermilk Park facilities which will provide a concession area.

Mr. Bledsoe asked about progress on collection of contributions for US 41 median landscaping. Mr. Holley stated that the Chamber of Commerce had indicated funding goals would be achieved.

Mr. Bledsoe asked that the staff investigate the possibility of a concessioner handling City Dock operations. Mr. Jones said that this could be a subject of a future workshop.

\*\*\*\*\*

City Manager Jones announced an additional discussion item regarding purchase of a site for the 5-million gallon water storage tank to replace the one in North Naples to be turned over to the County. Preparation of a final contract is imminent; some aspects of the project will be reviewed with the County because of the necessity for provisional use approval, Mr. Jones advised. He introduced Realtor R. Scott Cameron who has been acting as the City's agent.

Mr. Jones pointed out the proposed site on a map. It is located east of Goodlette Road and south of Moorings Park. It includes an area for a required water retention lake; proceeds from the fill derived from constructing this lake will be divided between the City and the adjacent property owner and should underwrite the cost of constructing the lake.

The site, Mr. Jones said, meets the City's requirements and the price is one of the more reasonable he has found. Cost is approximately \$400,000 for five acres, including the lake. If the tank is situated properly, he said, the property could also have other uses. For example, it is not unheard of to have a property outside the city limits for the recreational use, a consideration mentioned by Mr. Bledsoe earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Cameron advised that actual closing will take place at the end of August because the lake must

COUNCIL  
MEMBERS

M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
		Y E S	N O	

be constructed prior to closing. This will mean that the tank will be constructed by the middle of 1988, Mr. Jones added, which will fall within the County's planning for assuming the North Naples tank site.

Adjourned 11:45 a.m.

EDWIN J. PUTZELL, JR., Mayor

JANET CASON  
CITY CLERK

TARA A. NORMAN  
ADMINISTRATIVE AIDE

These minutes were approved on \_\_\_\_\_.



# City of Naples

## MEMO

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL  
FROM: NAPLES PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS  
SUBJECT: ANNUAL REPORT  
DATE: DECEMBER 29, 1986

The Parks & Recreation Advisory Board would like to summarize its activities for 1986.

- 1) In May, members of the Board toured facilities in a large van in order to be able to discuss each park as we were physically there. All Board members agreed that this was something that should be done on a yearly basis.
- 2) A heating unit was installed at the River Park Community Center based on a C.I.P. recommendation by the Advisory Board.
- 3) Three years ago, the Board worked on locating a suitable site in the City for a Bandshell. Finally, the site was chosen and the Bandshell is now under construction.
- 4) The Board recommended the expansion of Fleischmann Park to the South. This project was proposed about two years ago and enables teams to have a practice area without tearing up the main football field.
- 5) Renovations to the City Pier's Bait/Concession Stand were made to give these facilities a new look as well as make general repairs that were needed.
- 6) Support was given for the construction of the P.A.L. Building.
- 7) Board support was given for the construction of the River Park Open Air Shelter.

The Board respectfully recommends the following programs for next year.

- 1) The Board recognizes the need for a multi-passenger van for the Recreation Division. This could be used for the Board's annual tour/visits to the parks as well as transporting various groups to different recreational classes.
- 2) It was suggested and agreed upon that the present location of the restrooms near the south end of the tennis courts is not an ideal location. It is recommended that either the physical location be changed or they be renovated.

Honorable Mayor and Members of City Council  
December 29, 1986  
Page 2

- 3) There was a general consensus among the Board members that the City should develop a long-range Master Plan for Parks development in the future. Although we are presently making progress in improving our parks, a more organized approach to future development is needed.
- 4) It is recommended that low or no-cost programs be attempted at the River Park Community Center.
- 5) The Advisory Board recommends that better channels of communication be opened between the Board and the City Council. Suggestions for improvement would be that City Council take the annual tour of our parks' facilities with the Advisory Board and that possibly this annual report be presented at a City Council workshop by the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.
- 6) The Advisory Board suggests the idea of developing a 50-meter community swimming pool at a centralized location.
- 7) The Board feels that the City-owned property adjacent to Anthony Park has a great deal of potential and should be looked at for future development
- 8) The Advisory Board continues to investigate and look toward developing a neighborhood park in the northeast area of the City.



Robert R. Smith, III  
Chairman  
Date:



CITY OF NAPLES  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

BUILDING AND ZONING		PLANNING	
	(F)	(F)	(F)
ADMINISTRATION	(F)		
CONTRACTORS EXAMINING BOARD	(RP)		
BOARD OF APPEALS	(RP)		
CODE ADOPTION	(RP)		
STATE/FEDERAL MANDATED REQUIREMENTS	(RP)		
OCCUPATIONAL LICENSE REVIEW	(RP)		
COMPUTERIZATION STUDY	(DP)		
		ADMINISTRATION	(F)
		PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD	(RP)
		ADMINISTRATION OF COMM. BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM	(RP)
		R/UDAT	(DP)
		LIAISON/SUPPORT WITH OUTSIDE GROUPS	(DP)
		CURRENT PLANNING	(F)
		PLAN REVIEW	(RP)
		PUBLIC INFORMATION	(RP)
		STAFF SUPPORT	(RP)
		RESEARCH/REPORTS	(RP)
		ZONING ORDINANCE REVIEW	(DP)
		HISTORIC PRESERVATION	(DP)
		LONG RANGE PLANNING	(F)
		COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW/REVISION	(RP)
		ANNEXATION POLICY	(DP)

(F) = FUNCTION  
(RP) = REQUIRED PROGRAM  
(DP) = DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM

*[Handwritten signature]*  
Chairman  
Date: