



Planning Board Staff Report

Meeting Date: December 5, 2025

TO: Marco Island Planning Board

FROM: Mary P. Holden, Planning Manager

DATE: November 21, 2025

RE: Boat Docking Facility Extension Petition BD 25-000210, Request to allow for a dock to encroach into side yard/riparian setback for the property located at 1695 Ludlow Rd.

OWNERS:

Terra Onken
1695 Ludlow Rd.
Marco Island, FL 34145

AGENT:

Duane Thomas
933 N. Collier Blvd.
Marco Island, FL 34145

PROJECT ADDRESS/ LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

1695 Ludlow Rd.
Marco Beach, Unit 13, Block 417, Lot 1
Parcel Id Number: 58115080006
RSF-3 Zoning

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The total length of the seawall is approximately 137.94 feet requiring a fifteen (15) foot setback from the property line. The request is to have a seven and one-half (7.5) foot setback along the southeast portion of the seawall. The application, response to the criteria used to review a variance and plans are attached.

Aerial of the Site



Zoning Map



STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has reviewed this application against the criteria use to analyze the requested riparian encroachment and our responses are below. The application contains the owner's response.

Below are the criteria contained in Section 54-115.(f). 1-10, of the City's Waterways and Beaches Code that are utilized to review a boat dock protrusion, as it relates to the Owner's request in this instance:

1. Whether or not the proposed boat docking facility meets the other standards set forth in this article.

The proposed dock meets the protrusion limits from both seawalls.

2. Whether or not the water depth where the proposed vessel(s) is to be located is sufficient (as a general guide, four feet mean low water is deemed to be sufficient) to allow for safe mooring of the vessel, thereby necessitating the extension, protrusion, or encroachment requested.

The applicant has indicated the water depth is sufficient.

3. Whether there are special conditions related to the subject property or waterway which justify the proposed dimensions and location of the proposed boat docking facility.

There are no special conditions related to the subject property or waterway. This end of the canal lot with two frontages is not uncommon.

4. Whether or not the proposed boat docking facility and moored vessel(s) protrude greater than 25 percent of the width of the navigable waterway, and whether or not a minimum of 50 percent of the waterway width between boat docking facilities and moored vessel(s) on the opposite side of the waterway is maintained in order to ensure reasonable waterway width for navigation. This requirement shall only be applicable for extension or protrusion requests.

The protrusion limits are met.

5. Whether or not the proposed boat docking facility is of the minimum dimensions necessary in order to adequately secure the moored vessel while providing reasonable access to the boat for routine maintenance without the use of excessive deck area.

The boat docking facility adequately provides reasonable access, with or without a variance.

6. Whether or not the proposed boat docking facility is of minimal dimensions and located to minimize the impact of view to the channel by surrounding property owners.

It is difficult to say if granting the variance will impact the surrounding property owner's view. The property owner provided a letter of no objection from the adjacent neighbor and this is at the end of canal.

7. Whether or not the proposed vessel(s) are in excess of 50 percent of the length of the water frontage on the subject property such that the extension of the boat docking facility may adversely impact the view to the channel by surrounding property owners. In the case of multifamily developments and public marinas, the 50 percent provision may be exceeded. This requirement shall only be applicable for extension or protrusion requests.

The vessel does not exceed 50% of the seawall.

8. Whether or not the proposed location and design of the boat docking facility and moored vessel(s) in combination is such that it may infringe upon the use of neighboring properties, including any existing boat docking facilities.

It is difficult to say if the encroachment will infringe upon the use of neighboring properties since Staff are not boat captains and docks can and are rebuilt over time. The proposed dock location (area of requested encroachment) appears that personal water craft will need to use a bit of the area in front of the neighbor to maneuver into the space/lifts.

9. Whether or not the seagrasses are located within 200 feet of the proposed boat docking facility.

This is not applicable.

10. Whether or not the proposed dock is subject to the manatee protection requirements set forth in section 54-117.

This is not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS:

Staff recommend the Planning Board deny the Owners' requested riparian encroachment based on the below findings:

1. There are no special conditions related to the subject property or waterway. This end of the canal lot with two frontages is not uncommon.
2. The boat docking facility adequately provides reasonable access, with or without a variance.
3. It is difficult to say if granting the variance will impact the surrounding property owner's view. The property owner provided a letter of no objection from the adjacent neighbor and this is at the end of canal.
4. It is difficult to say if the encroachment will infringe upon the use of neighboring properties since Staff are not boat captains and docks can and are rebuilt over time. The proposed dock location (area of requested encroachment) appears that personal water craft will need to use a bit of the area in front of the neighbor to maneuver into the space/lifts.