

Central Planning Authority

Agenda for a meeting of the Central Planning Authority to be held on **February 09, 2022 at 10:00am at Compass Centre, 2nd Floor, Loft Meeting Room.**

04th Meeting of the Year

CPA/04/22

Mr. Ian Pairaudeau (Chair)

Mr. Handel Whittaker (Deputy Chair)

Mr. Joshua Bernard

Mr. Gillard McLaughlin

Mr. Charles Russell Jr.

Mr. Windel Scott

Mr. Peter Campbell

Mr. Kenneth Ebanks

Ms. Danette McLaughlin

Ms. Shakina Bush

Ms. Christine Maltman, MCIP, AICP

Ms. Celecia Bancroft

Mr. Ashton Bodden

Mr. Haroon Pandohie (Executive Secretary)

Mr. Ron Sanderson (Deputy Director of Planning – Current Planning)

- 1. Confirmation of Minutes & Declarations of Conflicts/Interests**
- 2. Applications**
- 3. Development Plan Matters**
- 4. Planning Appeal Matters**
- 5. Matters from the Director of Planning**
- 6. CPA Members Information/Discussions**

List of Applications Presented at CPA/04/22

1. 1	Confirmation of Minutes of CPA/02/22 held on January 19, 2022.....	3
1. 2	Declarations of Conflicts/Interests	3
2.1	PRO-PLUS CONSTRUCTION LTD. (TAG) Block 15E Parcel 95 (P21-1317) (\$40 million) (NP).....	4
2.2	PRISMA (Trio) Block 17A Parcels 145, 146, & 170 Rem 1 (P21-1260) (\$125 million) (NP).....	11
3.0	<u>DEVELOPMENT PLAN MATTERS</u>	34
4.0	<u>PLANNING APPEAL MATTERS</u>	34
5.0	<u>MATTERS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING</u>	34
6.0	<u>CPA MEMBERS INFORMATION/DISCUSSION</u>	34

APPLICANTS ATTENDING THE AUTHORITY'S MEETING

APPLICANT NAME	TIME	ITEM	PAGE
Beachfront Apts	10:15	2.1	4
Prisma	1:00	2.2	11

1. 1 Confirmation of Minutes of CPA/03/22 held on February 02, 2022.

1. 2 Declarations of Conflicts/Interests

ITEM	MEMBER

2.0 APPLICATIONS

APPEARANCES (Items 2.1 to 2.2)

2.1 PRO-PLUS CONSTRUCTION LTD. (TAG) Block 15E Parcel 95 (P21-1317) (\$40 million) (NP)

Application for proposed 8 apartments, generator and retaining wall.

Appearance at 10:15

FACTS

<i>Location</i>	South Sound Road in George Town
<i>Zoning</i>	Beach Resort Residential
<i>Notification Results</i>	Objections
<i>Parcel size</i>	0.4 acres
<i>Parcel size required</i>	0.5 acres
<i>Current use</i>	House
<i>Proposed use</i>	Apartments
<i>Building Footprint</i>	3,979,400 sq. ft.
<i>Building Area</i>	20,305 sq. ft.
<i>Site Coverage</i>	22.2%
<i>Number of Units Allowed</i>	8
<i>Number of Units Proposed</i>	8
<i>Number of Bedrooms Allowed</i>	24
<i>Number of Bedrooms Proposed</i>	8
<i>Parking Required</i>	12
<i>Parking Proposed</i>	13

Recommendation: Discuss the application, **for the following reasons:**

- 1) Minimum Lot Area (0.4 acres vs 0.5 acres required)
- 2) Minimum Lot Width (94' vs 100' required)
- 3) Height (56' vs 55')
- 4) Rear Setback (24'2" vs 25' required - septic)
- 5) Parking design
- 6) Left Side Elevation Does Not Depict Ramp
- 7) Concerns of the objectors

AGENCY COMMENTS

Agency comments received to date have been provided below:

Department of Environment

DOE comments have not been submitted to date.

Department of Environmental Health (DEH)

DEH has no objections to the proposed in principle.

This development require eight (8) thirty three (33) gallon bins and an enclosure built to the department's requirements.

a. The enclosure should be located as closed to the curb as possible without impeding the flow of traffic.

b. The enclosure should be provided with a gate to allow removal of the bins without having to lift it over the enclosure.

Minimum Enclosure Dimensions

Number of Containers 8

Minimum Dimensions - Width 5' Length 10' Height 2.5'

Fire Department

The Fire Department has not yet reviewed the revised drawings.

Water Authority

Please be advised that the Water Authority's requirements for this development are as follows:

Wastewater Treatment & Disposal

- The developer shall provide a **septic tank(s)** with a capacity of at least 2,500 US gallons for the proposed, based on the following calculations:*

BUILDING	UNITS/BLDG	GPD/UNIT	GPD/BLDG
Apartments	8 x 1-Bed + Den Units	225gpd/Unit	1,800
TOTAL			1,800 GPD

- The septic tank shall be constructed in strict accordance with the Authority's standards. Each compartment shall have a manhole to allow for inspection and service. Manholes shall extend to or above grade and be fitted with covers that provide a water-tight seal and that can be opened and closed by one person with standard tools. Where septic tanks are located in traffic areas, specifications for a traffic-rated tank and covers are required.*

- ***Treated effluent from the septic tank shall discharge to an effluent disposal well constructed by a licensed driller in strict accordance with the Authority's standards. Licensed drillers are required to obtain the site-specific minimum borehole and grouted casing depths from the Authority prior to pricing or constructing an effluent disposal well.***
- ***To achieve gravity flow, treated effluent from the septic tank shall enter the disposal well at a minimum invert level of 4'11" above MSL. The minimum invert level is that required to maintain an air gap between the invert level and the water level in the well, which fluctuates with tides and perching of non-saline effluent over saline groundwater.***

For Water Authority approval at BCU stage, a detailed profile drawing of the proposed wastewater treatment system is required. The drawing shall indicate:

1. *If the proposed septic tank will be site-built or precast. (You may use the Water Authority drawing for site-built tanks available from the Authorities website or a Precast septic tank drawing if you intend to use a Precast Tank).*
2. *All dimensions and materials shall be provided for any site-built tanks.*
3. *Manhole extensions are permitted up to a maximum of 24" below finished grade.*
4. *Detailed specifications including make and model for (H-20) traffic-rated covers for septic tanks proposed to be located within traffic areas.*
5. *A detailed profile cross-section of the wastewater system clearly showing the plumbing from building stub out to the effluent disposal well achieving the minimum invert connection specified above. (Alternatively details of proposed lift station shall be required)*
6. *The Water Authorities updated 2020 effluent disposal well specifications.*
7. *A 30ft horizontal separation between the effluent disposal well and any stormwater drainage wells.*

Elevator Installation

Hydraulic elevators are required to have an approved pump with oil-sensing shut off installed in the sump pit. Specifications of the proposed pump shall be sent to the Water Authority at development.control@waterauthority.ky for review and approval.

Generator and Fuel Storage Tank(s) Installation

*In the event underground fuel storage tanks (USTs) are used the Authority requires the developer **to install monitoring wells for the USTs**. The exact number and location(s) of the monitoring wells will be determined by the Authority upon receipt of a detailed site plan showing location of the UST(s) and associated piping. The monitoring wells shall comply with the standard detail of the Water Authority linked below. All monitoring wells shall be accessible for inspection by the Authority. In the event above ground fuel storage tanks (ASTs) are used, monitoring wells will not be required.*

https://www.waterauthority.ky/upimages/download/USTMonitoringWellFeb2013_1445632994.pdf

Water Supply

The proposed development site is located within the Water Authority's piped water supply area.

- The developer shall contact Water Authority's Engineering Services Department at 949-2837, without delay, to be advised of the site-specific requirements for connection to the public water supply.
- The developer shall submit plans for the water supply infrastructure for the development to the Water Authority for review and approval.
- The developer shall install the water supply infrastructure within the site, under the Water Authority's supervision, and in strict compliance with the approved plans and Water Authority Guidelines for Constructing Potable Water Mains. The Guidelines and Standard Detail Drawings for meter installations are available via the following link to the Water Authority's web page: <http://www.waterauthority.ky/water-infrastructure>

The Authority shall not be held responsible for delays and/or additional costs incurred by the developer due to the developer's failure to provide sufficient notice to the Authority.

National Roads Authority

As per your memo dated December 21st, 2021 the NRA has reviewed the above-mentioned planning proposal. Please find below our comments and recommendations based on the site plan provided.

Retaining Wall

The four (4)ft retaining wall shall be no higher than two (2) ft ten (10) ft from the roads right of way in order to satisfy sight line for exiting vehicles. **Please have applicant comply.**

Driveway to Underground Parking

The proposed slope of the driveway to the underground parking (as shown on drawing A-101) at 9.3% (1 1/8":12") is too steep as the maximum recommended is 8%. **Please have applicant adjust.**

Road Capacity Issues

The traffic demand to be generated by a residential development of eight (8) multi-family units has been assessed in accordance with ITE Code 220. Thus, the assumed average trip rates per dwelling unit provided by ITE for estimating the daily, AM and PM peak hour trips are 6.65, 0.51 and 0.62 respectively. The anticipated traffic to be added onto South Sound Road is as follows:

Expected Daily Trip	AM Peak Hour Total Traffic	AM Peak 20% In	AM Peak 80% Out	PM Peak Hour Total Traffic	PM Peak 65% In	PM Peak 35% Out
53	4	1	3	5	3	2

Based on these estimates, the impact of the proposed development onto South Sound Road is considered to be minimal.

Access and Traffic Management Issues

One-way driveway aisles shall be a minimum of twelve (12) to sixteen (16) ft wide.

Entrance and exit curves shall have no less than fifteen (15) feet radius curves, and have a width of twenty-four (24) ft.

A six (6) foot sidewalk shall be constructed on South Sound Road, within the property boundary, to NRA standards.

Tire stops (if used) shall be placed in parking spaces such that the length of the parking space is not reduced below the sixteen (16) feet minimum.

Stormwater Management Issues

*The applicant is encouraged to implement state-of-the-art techniques that manage stormwater runoff **within the subject parcel** and retain existing drainage characteristics of the site as much as is feasible through innovative design and the use of alternative construction techniques. However, it is critical that the development be designed so that post-development stormwater runoff **is no worse than** pre-development runoff. To that effect, the following requirements should be observed:*

- The applicant shall demonstrate, prior to the issuance of any Building Permits, that the Stormwater Management system is designed to embrace storm water runoff produced from a rainfall intensity of 2 inches per hour for one hour of duration and ensure that surrounding properties and/or nearby roads are not subject to stormwater runoff from the subject site.*
- The stormwater management plan shall include spot levels (existing and finished levels) with details of the overall runoff scheme. Please have the applicant provide this information prior to the issuance of a building permit.*
- Construct a gentle 'hump' at the entrance/exit (along the entire width of each driveway) in order to prevent stormwater runoff from and onto South Sound Road. Suggested dimensions of the 'hump' would be a width of 6 feet and a height of 2-4 inches. Trench drains often are not desirable.*
- Curbing is required for the parking areas to control stormwater runoff.*
- Roof water runoff should not drain freely over the parking area or onto the surrounding property. Note that unconnected downspouts are not acceptable. We recommend piped connection to catch basins or alternative stormwater detention devices. Catch basins are to be networked, please have the applicant provide locations of such wells along with details of depth and diameter prior to the issuance of any Building Permits.*
- Sidewalk detail needs to be provided as per NRA specifications. See (<https://www.caymanroads.com/upload/files/3/Sidewalk%20&%20Curbing%20Details.pdf>)*

At the inspection stage for obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall demonstrate that the installed system will perform to the standard given. The National Roads Authority wishes to bring to the attention of the Planning Department that non-

compliance with the above-noted stormwater requirements would cause a road encroachment under Section 16 (g) of The Roads Act (2005 Revision). For the purpose of this Act, Section 16(g) defines encroachment on a road as

"any artificial canal, conduit, pipe or raised structure from which any water or other liquid escapes on to any road which would not but for the existence of such canal, conduit, pipe or raised structure have done so, whether or not such canal, conduit, pipe or raised structure adjoins the said road;"

Failure in meeting these requirements will require immediate remedial measures from the applicant.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS

General

The subject property is located on South Sound Road in George Town, two properties east of Careys Black Coral.

The property currently contains a house and the proposal is for 8 one bedroom apartments with den.

The original submission included a seaside pool, seawall and cabana but these features have been removed from the site plan due to objectors' comments.

Zoning

The property is zoned Beach Resort Residential.

Specific Issues

1) Minimum Lot Area (0.4 acres vs 0.5 acres required)

Regulation 15(4)(a)(iii) states that the minimum lot area for apartments shall be 0.5 acres.

The subject property has a lot area of 0.4 acres.

2) Minimum Lot Width (94' vs 100' required)

Regulation 15(4)(d) requires a minimum lot width of 100 feet for apartments.

The subject property has a width of 94 feet.

3) Height (56' vs 55')

The right side elevation depicts a 56 foot high elevation from finished grade to the roof and five storeys, including the partially submerged basement.

Regulation 8(2)(f) limits the height of a building in the Beach Resort Residential Zone to 55 feet or four storeys.

4) Rear Setback

Regulation 15(4)(b)(ii) requires a minimum 25 foot road setback for buildings exceeding one storey.

The proposal is for a septic setback of 24' 2".

5) Parking design

The applicant is proposing 9 covered basement parking spaces and 4 surface spaces. The vehicles parking in the 2 spaces along the easterly boundary will have to reverse for a considerable distance backward into the driveway in order to then turn to exit through the basement parking. Vehicles parking in the 2 spaces along the western boundary will have to reverse out of the spaces and then reverse into the exit land leaving the basement parking area. Neither scenario is ideal and the Authority needs to determine if this design feature is acceptable.

6) Left Side Elevation Does Not Depict Ramp

The left side elevation does not depict the automobile ramp that is used to access the underground parking area.

2.2 PRISMA (Trio) Block 17A Parcels 145, 146, & 170 Rem 1 (P21-1260) (\$125 million) (NP)

Application for proposed mixed use development:

- Apartments (x 58)
- Townhouses (x 20)
- Duplexes (x 5)
- Hotel (44 rooms)
- Restaurant
- Parking garage
- Pools (x 20)
- Generators (x 4)
- Canal extension

Appearance at 1:00

FACTS

<i>Location</i>	Crichton Drive, West Bay
<i>Zoning</i>	Hotel/Tourism & Low Density Residential
<i>Notification Results</i>	Objections
<i>Parcel size</i>	7.54 acres combined
<i>Parcel size required</i>	0.5 acres
<i>Current use</i>	Vacant
<i>Proposed use</i>	Mixed Use Development
<i>Proposed Building Footprint</i>	77,860.5 sq. ft.
<i>Proposed Building Area</i>	332,034 sq. ft.
<i>Parking Required</i>	219
<i>Parking Proposed</i>	239, 6 Accessible
<i>Number of Proposed Apartments</i>	58
<i>Number of Proposed Hotel Rooms</i>	44
<i>Number of Proposed Duplexes</i>	5 (10 units)
<i>Number of Proposed Townhouses</i>	30
<i>Parking required</i>	219
<i>Parking proposed</i>	235

Recommendation: Discuss the application, **for the following reasons:**

- 1) Zoning
- 2) Parking & Sidewalks within the Road Allowance

- 3) Concerns of the Objectors
- 4) Combination of 17A 145 & 146
- 5) Agency comments
- 6) Canal Setback for Townhouses (4'10" vs 20')
- 8) Hotel Setback to Crighton Drive (9'5" vs 20')
- 9) Duplex Setback from Canal (2'3" vs 20')

AGENCY COMMENTS

Comments from agencies that have responded to the circulation of the plans are provided below.

Water Authority Cayman

Please be advised that the Water Authority's requirements for this development are as follows:

Wastewater Treatment

The development shall be connected to the West Bay Beach Sewerage System (WBBSS).

- *The developer shall notify the Water Authority's Engineering Department at 949-2837 EXT: 3000, as soon as possible to ensure that:*
 - *the site-specific connection requirements are relayed to the developer,*
 - *any existing sewerage appurtenances on the property can be clearly marked to prevent damage (for which the developer would be held responsible), and*
 - *the Authority can make necessary arrangements for connection.*
- *A **grease interceptor with a minimum capacity of 5,969 US gallons** is required to pre-treat kitchen flows from fixtures and equipment with grease-laden waste. Fixtures and equipment includes: pot sinks, pre-rinse sinks, dishwashers, soup kettles or similar devices and floor drains. The outlet of the grease interceptor shall be plumbed to the sanitary sewage line leading to the WBBSS.*
- *The developer shall be responsible for providing the site-specific sewerage infrastructure required for connection to the WBBSS. The site's wastewater infrastructure shall be designed and installed to the Authority's specifications. Copies of the Authority's specifications are available at the Water Authority's office on Red Gate Road, or the web:*
http://www.waterauthority.ky/upimages/pagebox/Guidelines-Sewer_1425464500_1426308023.pdf
- *The developer shall submit plans for the infrastructure to the Authority for approval.*
- *The Authority shall make the final connection to the WBBSS, the cost of which shall be borne by the developer.*

The Authority will not be responsible for delays due to insufficient notice from the developer.

Requirement for Canal Permit per Water Authority Law

The Water Authority is charged under the Water Authority Law to protect groundwater. Section 34 (1) of the Water Authority Law (2018 Revision) requires that anyone who undertakes the construction, replacement or alteration of canals is required to obtain a permit from the Authority, subject to such terms and conditions as it deems fit. Section 2 (1) the Water Authority Law (2018 Revision) defines canals as any channel works which provide sea water direct access to inland areas which would not normally be in direct contact with the sea.

A canal permit will be considered by the Authority upon receipt of a completed canal permit application form, the application fee and required submittals. The application form may be downloaded from the Water Authority website:

http://www.waterauthority.ky/upimages/pagebox/CanalWorksApplicationRevNOV2018_1541708130.pdf

Please be advised that submitting a canal permit application to the Authority does not guarantee that the permit will be issued. If a canal permit is issued the Authority may require modifications of plans and/or impose specific conditions to protect surface and groundwater and to ensure that the applicant complies with the conditions of the permit.

Elevator Installation

Hydraulic elevators are required to have an approved pump with oil-sensing shut off installed in the sump pit. Specifications of the proposed pump shall be sent to the Water Authority at development.control@waterauthority.ky for review and approval.

Generator and Fuel Storage Tank(s) Installation

In the event underground fuel storage tanks (USTs) are used the Authority requires the developer to install monitoring wells for the USTs. The exact number and location(s) of the monitoring wells will be determined by the Authority upon receipt of a detailed site plan showing location of the UST(s) and associated piping. The monitoring wells shall comply with the standard detail of the Water Authority linked below. All monitoring wells shall be accessible for inspection by the Authority. In the event above ground fuel storage tanks (ASTs) are used, monitoring wells will not be required.

https://www.waterauthority.ky/upimages/download/USTMonitoringWellFeb2013_1445632994.pdf

Water Supply

Please be advised that the proposed development site is located within the Cayman Water Company's (CWC) piped water supply area.

- The developer is required to notify the Cayman Water Company without delay, to be advised of the site-specific requirements for connection.

The developer shall provide water supply infrastructure per CWC's specification and under CWC's supervision

Fire Department

The Fire Department has stamp approved the drawings.

Department Of Environmental Health (DEH)

This application is not recommended for approval for the following reasons:

Solid Waste Facility: This development will require (4) 8 cubic yard containers with 4 times per week servicing. The drawing must be revised to indicate the number of bins required.

Restaurant: The following must be provided for review and approval at the BCU stage:
1. Detailed plans showing the kitchen layout with all equipment. 2. Seating capacity for the restaurant. 3. Restrooms must not open directly unto dinning or seating area. 4. Specifications on all equipment including the exhaust system and hot water heater.

Swimming Pool: A swimming pool application must be submitted to DEH for review and approval prior to constructing the pool.

It is noted that the applicant has revised the plans to address the DEH comments and new comments have yet to be received.

National Roads Authority

As per your memo dated January 6th 2022 the NRA has reviewed the above-mentioned planning proposal. Please find below our comments and recommendations based on the site plan provided.

General Issue

The applicant is proposing eleven (11) access points onto Crighton Drive, three (3) of which are on the inside of a curve. With such a high number of access points the number of conflict points increases and the overall traffic flow decreases, therefore, the NRA requests that the CPA have the applicant reduce said access points to three (3) or four (4) at most.

This will require the applicant to amalgamate the individual parking lots, which will help with the overall traffic flow on Crighton Drive.

Proposed Canal

No blasting is allowed to occur within 500ft of residences, unless the blaster has written permission from the affected homeowners. Otherwise, in this area the excavation of the canal and the boat slips will need to occur through mechanical means only.

The NRA recommends that the stormwater be intercepted and suitably disposed of so that surface water runoff and pollutants don't also affect the water quality. The drainage should be directed away from the canal system and the north sound for appropriate disposal.

Road Capacity Issues

The traffic demand to be generated by the above proposed mixed-use development of a

- *five (5) single family homes;*
- *98 (ninety-eight) multi-family homes;*
- *44 room hotel; and a*
- *5,969 sq. ft., Restaurant*

Has been assessed in accordance with ITE Codes

- *210 – Single Family Homes;*
- *220 – Apartments;*
- *310 – Hotel; and*
- *931 – Quality Restaurant.*

The anticipated traffic to be added onto Crighton Drive is as follows:

ITE Code	Expected Daily Trip	AM Peak Hour Total Traffic	AM Peak In	AM Peak Out	PM Peak Hour Total Traffic	PM Peak In	PM Peak Out	Pass-By
210	48	4	1	3	5	3	2	N/A
220	652	50	10	40	61	39	21	N/A
310	392	29	17	12	31	15	16	N/A
931	540	5	N/A	N/A	45	17	8	20
Total	1,632	88	28	55	142	74	47	20

Based on these estimates, the impact of the proposed development onto Crighton Drive is considered to be moderate. The NRA would request that the CPA have the applicant reconsider the intensity of the development as Crighton Drive, although the pavement after our last inspection in 2020 is considered fair averaging at 76, has been noted to have some base issues as can be noted with the undulations (or wave like) patterns of the road.

Access and Traffic Management Issues

Two-way driveway aisles shall be a minimum of twenty-two (22) ft. wide.

Entrance and exit curves shall have no less than fifteen (15) feet radius curves, and have a width of twenty-four (24) ft.

A six (6) foot sidewalk shall be constructed on Crighton Drive, within the property boundary, to NRA standards. Please have applicant adjust and comply.

Tire stops (if used) shall be place in parking spaces such that the length of the parking space is not reduced below the sixteen (16) feet minimum.

Stormwater Management Issues

*The applicant is encouraged to implement state-of-the-art techniques that manage stormwater runoff **within the subject parcel** and retain existing drainage characteristics of the site as much as is feasible through innovative design and use of alternative construction techniques. However, it is critical that the development be designed so that post-development stormwater runoff **is no worse than** pre-development runoff. To that effect, the following requirements should be observed:*

- The applicant shall demonstrate, prior to the issuance of any Building Permits, that the Stormwater Management system is designed to embrace storm water runoff produced from a rainfall intensity of 2 inches per hour for one hour of duration and ensure that surrounding properties and/or nearby roads are not subject to stormwater runoff from the subject site.*
- The stormwater management plan shall include spot levels (existing and finished levels) with details of the overall runoff scheme. Please have applicant provide this information prior to the issuance of a building permit.*
- Construct a gentle 'hump' at the entrance/exit (along the entire width of each driveway) in order to prevent stormwater runoff from and onto Crighton Drive. Suggested dimensions of the 'hump' would be a width of 6 feet and a height of 2-4 inches. Trench drains often are not desirable.*
- Curbing is required for the parking areas to control stormwater runoff.*
- Roof water runoff should not drain freely over the parking area or onto surrounding property. Note that unconnected downspouts are not acceptable. We recommend piped connection to catch basins or alternative stormwater detention devices. Catch basins are to be networked, please have applicant to provide locations of such wells along with details of depth and diameter prior to the issuance of any Building Permits.*
- Sidewalk detail needs to be provided as per NRA specifications. See (<https://www.caymanroads.com/upload/files/3/Sidewalk%20&%20Curbing%20Detail.s.pdf>)*

At the inspection stage for obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall demonstrate that the installed system will perform to the standard given. The National Roads Authority wishes to bring to the attention of the Planning Department that non-compliance with the above-noted stormwater requirements would cause a road encroachment under Section 16 (g) of The Roads Act (2005 Revision). For the purpose of this Act, Section 16(g) defines encroachment on a road as

"any artificial canal, conduit, pipe or raised structure from which any water or other liquid escapes on to any road which would not but for the existence of such canal, conduit, pipe or raised structure have done so, whether or not such canal, conduit, pipe or raised structure adjoins the said road;"

Failure in meeting these requirements will require immediate remedial measures from the applicant.

Department of Environment

This review is provided by the Director of the Department of Environment under delegated authority from the National Conservation Council (section 3 (13) of the National Conservation Act, 2013).

Given the type of development (i.e. a hotel/resort development), the scale and the location of the proposal, the project was screened for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as outlined in Schedule 1 of the National Conservation Council's Directive for EIAs issued under section 3(12) (j) and which has effect under section 43(2) (c) of the National Conservation Act. The Screening Opinion was considered and endorsed by the National Conservation Council at their meeting on the 19th of January 2022 and is provided in appendix 1 of this review attached. It was determined that whilst there are environmental impacts associated with this project, as detailed below and in the Screening Opinion, the project does not require an EIA to be conducted.

The Site and Ecology

The land area of the site is man-modified (as shown in Figure 1 below); it was historically cleared of mangroves and filled and is therefore of limited ecological value. However, the canal areas around the site are of ecological value as they contain seagrass beds, benthic algae and marine species which rely on these important habitats. Direct impacts will be caused in the areas where the canal is to be filled and those sections of proposed new waterways. Indirect impacts will also be caused by the excavation of the material in the boat slips and canal extension as well as in the construction of the proposed docks. Fine silt is easily disturbed and suspended during excavation in marl areas resulting in detrimental sediment plumes which can impact surrounding seagrass communities and marine organisms that depend on good water quality. Therefore, it is important to limit the impacts of sediment plumes generated during the works through the use of silt screens and other turbidity control measures. The applicant has indicated in their submission that they intend to use silt screens to militate against this risk.

Additionally, the extension of the canal will add further water volume towards the end of a 'deadend' canal system that may have implications for water quality due to inadequate water movement and flushing. Canals in excess of 8ft water depth (the proposed is to be excavated to 12ft) often are too deep to allow sufficient ambient light to reach the canal seafloor which prevents the establishment of marine plants and algae responsible for assisting with water quality through absorption of excess nutrients and production of oxygen. Given the massing of boating facilities, marinas and theoretical number of boats proposed for this small area of canal there is a potential for boating related pollution to further exacerbate poor water quality. Water quality concerns associated with the extension to the existing canal and its impacts on water movement and flushing on the overall ecological health of the marine waters in the vicinity of the development should be addressed through the use of recognised flushing analysis models.

Socio-Economics

Given the large number of uncertainties around local and international COVID-19 restrictions and reopening strategy, forecasting future hotel demand is extremely challenging. Recovery of the tourism industry on a whole is likely to be difficult to predict

and COVID-19 has also accelerated the adoption of alternatives to travel such as the use of digital collaboration tools reducing the need to travel for face-to-face meetings, which is likely to have long-term implications for business travel demand. The draft National Planning Framework recognises that “the growth of tourism in the Cayman Islands, particularly the development of large hotels and condos along Seven Mile Beach, can appear to dominate the streetscape and create a perception that overdevelopment is occurring” (section 12, P.100). Goal 1 of the Tourism chapter includes the following action items:

- Ensure that future tourist accommodation is deemed necessary and designed with long term goals in mind.*
- Applications should be accompanied by a market analysis that illustrates demand for the proposed development.*

RB5- The Road Back to 500K Air Arrivals Strategic Tourism Plan, Reassessed Goal 2 states “There is significant economic fallout for many small businesses and some larger ones. The focus will now be on helping tourism enterprises to recover and survive when the country reopens. It will not be possible to save all businesses, but urgent efforts will be made to assess and provide support, where feasible. The nature of the support referred to in item (5) will be adjusted so that while focus remains on developing some new businesses there will be a concerted effort to support existing ones.” Item 5 above refers to “Facilitate and attract development of small and micro tourism-related businesses, boutique hotels, vacation homes, and other non-traditional accommodations services in priority sustainable development areas.” Appendix 3 of RB5 lists potential and approved/incomplete projects likely to come online that could saturate Grand Cayman’s accommodation market at a time when there will be increased competition between destinations and on-island as tourism recovers. Accordingly, there should be an evaluation of the need for further hotel development in the western part of Grand Cayman. Item 5 as detailed above refers to the need to support boutique hotels, vacation homes, and non-traditional accommodation services, and the approval of a further 9 storey hotel goes against this policy.

Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Overlooking and Cumulative Effects

The Proposed Development has three 7-storey buildings and three 9-storey buildings of up to 120ft tall. As the adjacent properties to the north are single family homes in fairly close proximity, there is significant overlook by the Proposed Development. The nearest single family home to the Proposed Development is approximately 175ft from the nearest 120ft tall 9-storey building. The Proposed Development will likely cause adverse effects on the adjacent property from overshadowing and overlooking, potentially undermining the privacy of those properties.

Consideration should be given to whether this scale of development is appropriate in this instance given the character of the area and the proximity of existing residential properties. Although ten storey buildings are becoming more common along the Seven Mile Beach corridor and in Camana Bay, this proposal would be the tallest on the North Sound coastline outside of a Planned Area Development. Consideration should be given to the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development in the context of the already proposed and potential development of the wider area, especially in relation to the

viability of tourism as outlined in the socio-economics section above. With several new hotels proposed for development and currently under construction along the Seven Mile Beach corridor including the Grand Hyatt and Hotel Indigo this project will add to the accumulation of hotel capacity for which the need should be suitably assessed.

Conclusions

While the DOE does not recommend the Proposed Development be the subject of an EIA, there are potential significant impacts to the surrounding areas due to the excavation works to expand the canal areas, water quality issues relating to increased length of the canal, overshadowing and overlooking of the neighbouring properties, and traffic impacts. However, an EIA is not considered the most appropriate vehicle to assess these effects. The Department of Planning is developing the draft National Planning Framework which would include carrying capacity studies to examine and determine the potential growth within the Seven Mile Beach corridor which should be used to assess proposals such as this one. Similarly the Revised Tourism Plan for the Cayman Islands 2020 should be considered and give guidance to the suitability of a project like the Proposed Development.

The DOE recommends that a hotel needs assessment is carried out to determine the need for hotels in this area. We strongly recommend that this study is completed and the results are reviewed prior to determining this planning application.

In addition, water quality concerns associated with the extension to the existing canal and its impacts on water movement and flushing on the overall ecological health of the marine waters in the vicinity of the development should be addressed through the use of recognised flushing analysis models. Best practice would dictate that this should be required prior to determination of the application. However, if the CPA is minded not to require this in advance of determination, at a minimum it should be a condition of the planning permission.

Screening Opinion for the Proposed Land Ltd. (Prisma) Hotel and Condo. Development 7 Jan 2022

Executive Summary

The National Conservation Council's (NCC) Directive for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) notes that all activities listed in Schedule 1 will be considered against the screening criteria outlined in the Directive to determine whether an EIA may be required.

The Proposed Development, Land Ltd. (Prisma) Hotel and Condos, is a proposal including a 9-storey hotel with 44 guestrooms, 5 apartment buildings (7 or 9 storeys in height) with 58 apartments, 10 duplexes, 20 townhouses, 5 house lots, a restaurant, a bar/café, 20 pools, a canal marina, docks and parking facilities. As the Proposed Development is a hotel development, it was screened to determine whether an EIA was required. Five potential areas of impact were identified: transport, socio-economics, water quality, overlooking and overshadowing and cumulative effects.

The main socio-economic consideration in relation to the Proposed Development is the need for a further 9-storey hotel development, particularly in the face of great economic uncertainty associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. The DOE recommends that a hotel needs assessment is carried out to determine the suitability of hotels in this area as per the recommendations of the Draft National Planning Framework and the Tourism Plan for the Cayman Islands 2020. Additionally, water quality concerns associated with the extension to the existing canal and its impacts on water movement and flushing on the overall ecological health of the marine waters in the vicinity of the development should be addressed through the use of recognised flushing analysis models.

Other implications should also be assessed in the planning application review, including the impacts of overlooking and overshadowing on surrounding land uses and the impact on traffic.

The Department of Environment is of the opinion that the Proposed Development does not require an EIA in order for these concerns to be appropriately addressed.

Introduction

The process for determining whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is needed is a statutory process that is governed by the National Conservation Act (NCA). This first stage, where the relevant authorities decide if a development is one requiring an EIA (i.e. requires an EIA), is called screening.

The National Conservation Council's (NCC) Directive for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) issued under section 3(12) (j) and which has effect under section 43(2) (c) of the NCA, notes that all activities listed in Schedule 1 will be considered against the screening criteria outlined in sections 2 to 3 of Schedule 1 of the Directive to determine whether an EIA may be required. The Proposed Development falls within Schedule 1, i.e. a hotel development.

The screening criteria include:

- The type and characteristics of a development;*
- The location of a development; and*
- The characteristics of the potential impact.*

These screening criteria have been considered with respect to the Proposed Development in order to determine whether an EIA is required.

The Site

The site is located at Block 17A Parcels 170REM1, 145 and 146, on Crighton Drive in Crystal Harbour. Figure 1 shows the site location. The site occupies an area of approximately 6.25 acres surrounded by single home residential parcels, the North Sound Golf Course and the Holiday Inn Hotel. The parcels to the south of the Proposed Development are vacant residential parcels adjacent to the Golf Course. The parcels to the north and west are single family home residential properties. The parcels to the west of the Proposed Development are future apartment developments forming part of the Diamond's Edge project and the existing 3-storey Holiday Inn Hotel. The subject parcel is currently zoned as Hotel/Tourism Zone 1. The site is man-modified and of low

ecological value as it was filled during the original works to create Crystal Harbour. However, the works to expand the water ways into the property in order to provide the marina and boat slips has the potential to impact the surrounding canal (see Ecology section below).

The geo-technical characteristics of the site may also be of concern due to the potentially inadequate fill stability from the original works. The site was originally mangroves and the area was transformed into a dredged and filled residential canal development during the 1980s/90s. Although the excavated fill material is typically marl and considered suitable for the building of smaller scale developments such as houses, there are known to be areas where de-mucking of underlying layers of peat was not carried out. These underlying layers of unstable material have caused issues with subsidence in structures including the roads in this area in the past. Geotechnical investigations should be thorough in order to ensure that the site is suitable for the construction of large buildings up to 9-storeys high.

Proposed Development

Description of the Proposed Development

The Proposed Development, Land Ltd. (Prisma) Hotel and Condos, is a proposal including a 9-storey hotel with 44 guestrooms, 5 apartment buildings (7 or 9 storeys in height) with 58 apartments, 10 duplexes, 20 townhouses, 5 house lots, a restaurant, a bar/café, 20 pools, a canal marina, docks and parking facilities. The proposed maximum building height of 120ft conforms to the maximum permitted height of a building of 130ft in Hotel/Tourism Zone 1.

Planning History

There have been no applications or other actions for this site since Crystal Harbour was filled and the parcels were subdivided to create the residential area.

Characteristics of Potential Impact

The baseline conditions, the potential impact of the Proposed Development and any likely significant effects have been qualitatively assessed for each of the below environmental aspects. Having due regard to air quality, architectural and archaeological heritage, climate change, flood risk, ground conditions, and noise and vibrations, there are not considered to be significant adverse environmental impacts in this area. With respect to climate change, the proposed development is set back from the coastline and is proposed to be filled to a ground elevation of 8ft above mean sea level around building footprints, therefore it has low vulnerability to sea-level rise. However all structures in the Cayman Islands will be susceptible to an increase in the intensity of storms and more intense but fewer rain events.

Ecology

The land area of the site is man-modified, having been historically cleared of mangroves and filled, it is therefore of limited ecological value. However, the canal areas around the site are of ecological value as they contain seagrass beds, benthic algae and multiple marine species which rely on these important habitats.. Although the proposal does not seek to alter the existing waterway areas, direct impacts will be caused in the areas where

these are connected to the proposed waterway sections, including the boat slips on the northern edge of the development and the canal extension on the south. The connection of these areas to the existing canal will mean the removal of the existing seawall and excavation of the 'shelf' area which supports it. These works will also potentially cause indirect impacts to the canals by the excavation of the material in the boat slips and canal extension as well as in the construction of the proposed docks. Fine silt is easily disturbed and suspended during excavation in marl areas resulting in detrimental sediment plumes which can impact surrounding seagrass communities and marine organisms that depend on good water quality. Therefore, it is important to limit the impacts of sediment plumes generated during the works through the use of silt screens and other turbidity control measures. The applicant has indicated in their submission that they intend to use silt screens to militate against this risk.

Additionally, the extension of the canal will add further water volume towards the end of a 'dead-end' canal system that may have implications for water quality due to inadequate water movement and flushing. Canals in excess of 8ft water depth often are too deep to allow sufficient ambient light to reach the canal seafloor which prevents the establishment of marine plants and algae responsible for assisting with water quality through absorption of excess nutrients and production of oxygen. Given the massing of boating facilities, marinas and theoretical number of boats proposed for this small area of canal there is a potential for boating related pollution to further exacerbate poor water quality. Consequently, water quality concerns associated with the extension to the existing canal and its impacts on water movement and flushing on the overall ecological health of the marine waters in the vicinity of the development should be addressed through the use of recognised flushing analysis models.

Socio-Economics

Socio-economics refers to the analysis of how economic activity affects how societies progress, stagnate or regress because of their local or regional economy, or the global economy. The main socio-economic consideration with the Proposed Development is the need for a further large scale apartment and hotel development, particularly in the face of great economic uncertainty associated with COVID-19.

The negative effects of COVID-19 on the global, regional and local travel industry have been unprecedented. Given the large number of uncertainties around local and international COVID-19 restrictions and reopening strategy, forecasting future hotel demand is extremely challenging. Recovery of the tourism industry on a whole is likely to be difficult to predict and COVID-19 has also accelerated the adoption of alternatives to travel such as the use of digital collaboration tools reducing the need to travel for face-to-face meetings, which is likely to have long-term implications for business travel demand.

Further, the draft National Planning Framework recognises that "the growth of tourism in the Cayman Islands, particularly the development of large hotels and condos along Seven Mile Beach, can appear to dominate the streetscape and create a perception that overdevelopment is occurring" (section 12, P.100). Goal 1 of the Tourism chapter includes the following action items:

- *Ensure that future tourist accommodation is deemed necessary and designed with long term goals in mind.*
- *Applications should be accompanied by a market analysis that illustrates demand for the proposed development.*

The National Tourism Plan (2019-2023) conducted situation analysis which revealed that the spatial distribution of impacts from visitation in Grand Cayman are highly concentrated in the western districts of George Town and West Bay. The districts of Bodden Town, North Side and East End are receiving lower levels of visitation and hence less pressure on tourist attractions (Annex A). The Tourism Plan does not include the objective or goal of further hotel development on the western side of Grand Cayman, instead it notes that the growth in demand for “alternative accommodations” is an important source of competitive advantage for the Cayman Islands, given the Island’s significant inventory of vacation homes and condominiums. The Plan notes that the country has an opportunity to attract visitors looking for unique and distinctive accommodation, with substantial unexploited potential for the development of small and micro tourism-related businesses, guest houses, boutique hotels and home sharing accommodation facilities especially in less-visited areas (East End, North Side, Bodden Town, Cayman Brac, and Little Cayman) (Strategy 2.5).

RB5 The Road Back to 500K Air Arrivals Strategic Tourism Plan, Reassessed Goal 2 states “There is significant economic fallout for many small businesses and some larger ones. The focus will now be on helping tourism enterprises to recover and survive when the country reopens. It will not be possible to save all businesses, but urgent efforts will be made to assess and provide support, where feasible. The nature of the support referred to in item (5) will be adjusted so that while focus remains on developing some new businesses there will be a concerted effort to support existing ones.”

Item 5 above refers to “Facilitate and attract development of small and micro tourism-related businesses, boutique hotels, vacation homes, and other non-traditional accommodations services in priority sustainable development areas.” Appendix 3 of RB5 lists potential and approved/incomplete projects likely to come online that could saturate Grand Cayman’s accommodation market at a time when there will be increased competition between destinations and on-island as tourism recovers. Accordingly, there should be an evaluation of the need for further hotel development in the western part of Grand Cayman. Item 5 as detailed above refers to the need to support boutique hotels, vacation homes, and non-traditional accommodation services, and the approval of a further 9 storey hotel goes against this policy.

Transport

The Proposed Development has 223 parking spaces. There is potential for the Proposed Development to cause significant traffic impacts in the Crystal Harbour area with the addition of road users from the hotel and apartment development depending on the usage of vehicles and the amount of journeys taken. This potential is in part exacerbated by the cumulative effect of other large scale developments planned for the Crystal Harbour area, such as the Diamond’s Edge residential development, and the limited existing road infrastructure with only one road access connection to the Esterly Tibbett’s Highway via Safehaven Drive. However, we do not believe an EIA is required solely to address the

issue of parking provision. A Traffic Impact Assessment should be undertaken for evaluation by the National Roads Authority in their consideration of this proposal.

There is also likely to be an increase in boat traffic in the canal system due to the Proposed Development; submitted plans indicate that boat slips and docks to accommodate at least 34 boats will be built. Although this is not likely to result in the congestion of the canal by boat traffic there is the potential for an increase in noise and incidence of use of the canal by commercial boats taking passengers to and from the Proposed Development's hotel. It should be considered whether the Crystal Harbour canal development is suitable for and was intended for the berthing and passage of commercial boats especially given the current single residence land use of the area.

Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Overlooking

The Proposed Development has three 7-storey buildings and three 9-storey buildings of up to 120ft tall. As the adjacent properties to the north are single family homes in fairly close proximity, there is significant overlook by the Proposed Development. The nearest single family home to the Proposed Development is approximately 175ft from the nearest 120ft tall 9-storey building. The Proposed Development will likely cause adverse effects on the adjacent property from overshadowing and overlooking, potentially undermining the privacy of those properties. Consideration should be given to whether this scale of development is appropriate in this instance given the character of the area and the proximity of existing residential properties.

Cumulative Effects

Although ten storey buildings are becoming more common along the Seven Mile Beach corridor and in Camana Bay, this proposal would be the tallest on the North Sound coastline outside of a Planned Area Development. The proposed development will be visually prominent and there will be visual amenity effects as it will be visible from much of the North Sound Coastline as many of the other large buildings along Seven Mile Beach are. The cumulative effect of buildings of this height should be considered as it will significantly alter the skyline of this part of Grand Cayman.

As previously mentioned, traffic impacts are also a potentially significant negative impact of the Proposed Development and the effects of this would accumulate with the construction of other developments in this area potentially causing traffic issues due to the limited road infrastructure linking the area to the Esterly Tibbetts Highway.

Consideration should be given to the Cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development in the context of the already proposed and potential development of the wider area, especially in relation to the viability of tourism as 7 outlined in the socio-economics section above. With several new hotels proposed for development and currently under construction along the Seven Mile Beach corridor including the Grand Hyatt and Hotel Indigo this project will add to the accumulation of hotel capacity for which the need should be suitably assessed.

Conclusions

While the DOE does not recommend the Proposed Development be the subject of an EIA, there are potential significant impacts to the surrounding areas due to the excavation works to expand the canal areas, water quality issues relating to increased length of the

canal, overshadowing and overlooking of the neighbouring properties, and traffic impacts. However, an EIA is not considered the most appropriate vehicle to assess these effects. The Department of Planning is developing the draft National Planning Framework which would include carrying capacity studies to examine and determine the potential growth within the Seven Mile Beach corridor which should be used to assess proposals such as this one. Similarly the Revised Tourism Plan for the Cayman Islands 2020 should be considered and give guidance to the suitability of a project like the Proposed Development.

The DOE recommends that a hotel needs assessment is carried out to determine the need for hotels in this area. We strongly recommend that this study is completed and the results are reviewed prior to determining this planning application.

In addition, water quality concerns associated with the extension to the existing canal and its impacts on water movement and flushing on the overall ecological health of the marine waters in the vicinity of the development should be addressed through the use of recognised flushing analysis models.

After considering the Screening Opinion detailed above, the NCC is required to issue its decision to the originating entity on the requirement for an EIA, pursuant to Section 43 (1)

Notice of National Conservation Council Decision Ref:

Proposed Land Ltd. (Prisma) Hotel and Condo. Development

1) The Proposed Development, Land Ltd. (Prisma) Hotel and Condos, is a proposal including a 9-storey hotel with 44 guestrooms, 5 apartment buildings (7 or 9 storeys in height) with 58 apartments, 10 duplexes, 20 townhouses, 5 house lots, a restaurant, a bar/café, 20 pools, a canal marina, docks and parking facilities.

2) The proposed action is Planning Approval by the Central Planning Authority (CPA) of the Proposed Development.

3) The Proposed Development is a hotel development and so falls within Schedule 1 (those proposed activities which need to be screened to determine if an Environmental Impact Assessment is required) of the National Conservation Council's Directive for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) issued under section 3(12) (j) and which has effect under section 43(2) (c) of the National Conservation Act.

4) The Proposed Development was considered by the National Conservation Council at its working group session on 19 January 2022.

5) Council noted a variety of factors, including but not limited to a. The Department of Environment's Screening Opinion of 7 January 2022 for the Proposed Land Ltd. (Prisma) Hotel and Condo. Development. b. That relevant assessments of the possible impacts of the Proposed Development could be made which would allow the Central Planning Authority to make an informed decision, without recourse to a full Environmental Impact Assessment. c. That a hotel needs assessment should be carried out to determine the suitability of hotels in this area as per the recommendations of the Draft National Planning Framework and the Tourism Plan for the Cayman Islands 2020. d. That water

quality concerns associated with the extension to the existing canal and its impacts on water movement and flushing on the overall ecological health of the marine waters in the vicinity of the development should be addressed through the use of recognised flushing analysis models.

6) Under section 41(3) of the National Conservation Act, 2013, the Central Planning Authority shall take into account the views of the Council before making their decision regarding the proposed action.

7) Council decided that that the Proposed Development does not require an Environmental Impact Assessment.

8) And that this decision would need to be ratified at the next suitable General Meeting of the National Conservation Council.

9) It should be communicated to the CPA, and by the CPA through their usual and sufficient means of communication to the appropriate parties, that the CPA or a person aggrieved by a decision of the National Conservation Council may, within 21 days of the date on which the decision of the Council is received by them, appeal against the Council decision to the Cabinet by serving on the Cabinet notice in writing of the intention to appeal and the grounds of the appeal (Section 39 of the National Conservation Act, 2013).

OBJECTIONS

See Appendix B

APPLICANT'S DOCUMENTATION

Variance letter: see Appendix C

Design brief: see Appendix D

Land Ltd. Letter: see Appendix E

APPLICANTS LETTER ADDRESSING ALL DEPARTMENTS CONCERNS

Below please find the responses to your comments, and objections:

Comments from Planning:

1. SIDEWALKS AND PARKING WITHIN ROAD ALLOWANCE - REQUEST VARIANCE OR REVISE

A letter from Land Ltd, owner of Block 17A, Parcel 373 has been provided, granting this project the right to use of the Right of Way for construction of sidewalks, curbs, parking spaces and structures necessary for the proposed development. It is also important to note that Land Ltd has in the past provided such variances to homeowners facing the 50' Crighton Drive road reservation, to construct driveways, curbs, parking spaces and or landscape.

2. HAMMERHEAD REQUIRED - NO HAMMERHEAD PROVIDED FOR PROPOSED 5 RESIDENTIAL LOTS -SUGGEST REVISION

At a meeting held on January 12th, 2022 between Mr. Popovich and myself, it was agreed that a Hammerhead layout for the end of the interior road was not necessary.

3. SOLID WASTE FACILITIES - ONLY SOLID WASTE STORAGE I COULD FIND WAS AT THE PARKING GARAGE -SUGGEST MORE FACILITIES AROUND CANAL BASIN AND APARTMENT/HOTEL BLOCKS

Project will handle solid waste operationally, to ensure all waste for both residential and commercial is picked up and brought to the single centralized point, located at the parking lot.

4 SEWAGE TREATMENT - COULD FIND NO SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS OR SEPTIC SYSTEMS

Sewage system exists in Crystal Harbour. Prisma will connect to it.

5. SUBDIVISION LOT AREAS - REGULATION 11(1)(D) REQUIRES MINIMUM 10,000 SQ FT FOR HOUSES -ONLY ONE LOT SATISFIES THIS REQUIREMENT -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Plans have been revised to show a single vacant lot for future single-family homes, with a total area of +/- 42,000 s.f.

6. ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES - COULD ONLY FIND 2 SPACES ON SP1.3 - REQUIRE MINIMUM 6 -REVISE OR VARIANCE REQUIRED

Plans have been revised to show 6 accessible spaces

7. RESTAURANT SETBACK FROM CANAL - MINIMUM 20 FEET REQUIRED -14 9 PROPOSED -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Plans have been revised to show a 20'-0" setback from the canal

8. TOWNHOUSE 101 CANAL SETBACK - MIN 20 FEET REQUIRED -16 4 PROPOSED -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Variance to canal setback has been requested for Duplexes and Townhomes

9. TOWNHOUSE 504 SETBACK FROM SIDE BOUNDARY - MINIMUM 20 FEET REQUIRED -5 9 PROPOSED -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Plans have been revised to show 20'-0" side setback from the adjacent vacant lot

10. TOWNHOUSE CANAL SETBACKS - MIN 20 FEET REQUIRED -4 10 PROPOSED TO POOL -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Variance to canal setback has been requested for Duplexes and Townhomes

11. APARTMENT BUILDING 1 SETBACK FROM CANAL - MINIMUM 20 FEET REQUIRED -18 1 PROPOSED -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Plans have been revised to show a 20'-0" setback from the canal

12. HOTEL SETBACK TO CRIGHTON DRIVE - MINIMUM 20 FEET REQUIRED -9 5 PROPOSED -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Variance for this setback has been requested

13. DUPLEX SETBACKS FROM SIDE BOUNDARIES - MINIMUM 20 FEET REQUIRED -10 8 & 4 PROPOSED -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

As per Amendment to regulation 10, 6(g) side setback shall be 15'-0". Plans have been revised to show 15'-0" setback from side property lines

14. DUPLEX SETBACK FROM CANAL - MIN 20 FEET REQUIRED -2 3 PROPOSED - REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Variance to canal setback has been requested for Duplexes and Townhomes

15. PARKING - TOWNS AND DUPLEXES ARE FINE - APARTMENTS, RESTAURANT, RETAIL AND HOTEL REQUIRE 169 SPACES -154 PROPOSED -REVISE OR APPLY FOR VARIANCE

Plans have been revised to show a total of 239 spaces.

16. COMBINED LOT AREA - PLANS INDICATE 328,508 SQ FT -MY CALCULATION INDICATES 324,418.9 SQ FT

Letter from surveyor confirming the square footage has been provided.

Comments from Government Agencies:

DEH:

Solid Waste Facility: This development will require (4) 8 cubic yard containers with 4 times per week servicing. The drawing must be revised to indicate the number of bins required.

-Plans have been revised to show a Solid Waste Facility with the number of bins required

Restaurant: The following must be provided for review and approval at the BCU stage: 1. Detailed plans showing the kitchen layout with all equipment. 2. Seating capacity for the restaurant. 3. Restrooms must not open directly unto dining or seating area. 4. Specifications on all equipment including the exhaust system and hot water heater.

Swimming Pool: A swimming pool application must be submitted to DEH for review and approval prior to constructing the pool.

-All above comments will be addressed during the BCU permitting process.

Fire Department:

As per Building code amendments 310.2 Fire department vehicle access. All R1 and R2 occupancies three (3) or more stories in height shall provide open space of at least twenty (20) feet wide along three side of the building.

-Site plan has been revised to show a 20' wide Fire Lane, as required.

Please depict proposed Fire Hydrants and Fire wells.

-Site plan has been revised to show Fire Hydrants and Fire Wells, and details and calculations will be provided during the BCU permitting process.

DoE

Given the type of development (i.e. A hotel/resort development), the scale and the location of the proposal, the project was screened for an environmental impact assessment (EIA) as outlined in schedule 1 of the national conservation council's directive for EIAs issued under section 3(12) (j) and which has effect under section 43(2) (c) of the national conservation act. The screening opinion was considered and endorsed by the national conservation council at their meeting on the 19th of January 2022 and is provided in appendix 1 of this review attached. It was determined that whilst there are environmental impacts associated with this project, as detailed below and in the screening opinion, the project does not require an EIA to be conducted.

-We welcome the decision that this project does not require an EIA.

The site and ecology:

The land area of the site is man-modified (as shown in figure 1 below); it was historically cleared of mangroves and filled and is therefore of limited ecological value. However, the canal areas around the site are of ecological value as they contain seagrass beds, benthic algae and marine species which rely on these important habitats. Direct impacts will be caused in the areas where the canal is to be filled and those sections of proposed new waterways. Indirect impacts will also be caused by the excavation of the material in the boat slips and canal extension as well as in the construction of the proposed docks. Fine silt is easily disturbed and suspended during excavation in marl areas resulting in detrimental sediment plumes which can impact surrounding seagrass communities and marine organisms that depend on good water quality. Therefore, it is important to limit the impacts of sediment plumes generated during the works through the use of silt screens and other turbidity control measures. The applicant has indicated in their submission that they intend to use silt screens to militate against this risk.

Additionally, the extension of the canal will add further water volume towards the end of a 'dead-end' canal system that may have implications for water quality due to inadequate water movement and flushing. Canals in excess of 8ft water depth (the proposed is to be excavated to 12ft) often are too deep to allow sufficient ambient light to reach the canal seafloor which prevents the establishment of marine plants and algae 5 responsible for assisting with water quality through absorption of excess nutrients and production of oxygen. Given the massing of boating facilities, marinas and theoretical number of boats proposed for this small area of canal there is a potential for boating related pollution to further exacerbate poor water quality. Water quality concerns associated with the extension to the existing canal and its impacts on water movement and flushing on the overall ecological health of the marine waters in the vicinity of the development should be addressed through the use of recognized flushing analysis models.

-Developer will only allow two boats owned by the strata to moor along the central basin. No other boats will be allowed to moor along the boardwalk or within the central basin.

With regards to the existing canals and proposed extension, it is important to note that the depth of all existing canals in Crystal Harbour vary from 12' to 14'. Developer will consult

with a local Civil Engineer to review the options to address the DoE's concerns and will present these options during the BCU permitting process. Additionally, Developer will consult with the DoE on the sequencing of the canal extension, and the construction of the boat slips.

The site of the proposed hotel and condo development Socio-economics:

Given the large number of uncertainties around local and international covid-19 restrictions and reopening strategy, forecasting future hotel demand is extremely challenging. Recovery of the tourism industry on a whole is likely to be difficult to predict and covid-19 has also accelerated the adoption of alternatives to travel such as the use of digital collaboration tools reducing the need to travel for face-to-face meetings, which is likely to have long-term implications for business travel demand. The draft national planning framework recognizes that "the growth of tourism in the Cayman Islands, particularly the development of large hotels and condos along seven mile beach, can appear to dominate the streetscape and create a perception that overdevelopment is occurring" (section 12, p.100). Goal 1 of the tourism chapter includes the following action items:

- ensure that future tourist accommodation is deemed necessary and designed with long term goals in mind.*
- applications should be accompanied by a market analysis that illustrates demand for the proposed development.*

Rb5- the road back to 500k air arrivals strategic tourism plan, reassessed goal 2 states "there is significant economic fallout for many small businesses and some larger ones. The focus will now be on helping tourism enterprises to recover and survive when the country reopens. It will not be possible to save all businesses, but urgent efforts will be made to assess and provide support, where feasible. The nature of the support referred to in item (5) will be adjusted so that while focus remains on developing some new businesses there will be a concerted effort to support existing ones." Item 5 above refers to "facilitate and attract development of small and micro tourism-related businesses, boutique hotels, vacation homes, and other non-traditional accommodations services in priority sustainable development areas." Appendix 3 of rb5 lists potential and approved/incomplete projects likely to come online that could saturate grand 6 Cayman's accommodation market at a time when there will be increased competition between destinations and on-island as tourism recovers. Accordingly, there should be an evaluation of the need for further hotel development in the western part of grand Cayman. Item 5 as detailed above refers to the need to support boutique hotels, vacation homes, and non-traditional accommodation services, and the approval of a further 9 storey hotel goes against this policy.

-Although the proposed hotel is 9 stories, it is important to note that it includes only 44 Boutique style guest suites, which are scheduled to be completed in 3 years. It is also important to note that while the proposed apartment and hotel structures vary from 7 to 9 stories, each building contains only 10 and 14 units, respectively, and the hotel offers only 44 rooms. The density allowed for apartments in this site is 189 units, and our proposed development offers 58 (69% less); with regards to hotel rooms, the site allows for 490 rooms, and we are proposing 44 (91% less)

Daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking and cumulative effects

The proposed development has three 7-storey buildings and three 9-storey buildings of up to 120ft tall. As the adjacent properties to the north are single family homes in fairly close proximity, there is significant overlook by the proposed development. The nearest single-family home to the proposed development is approximately 175ft from the nearest 120ft tall 9-storey building. The proposed development will likely cause adverse effects on the adjacent property from overshadowing and overlooking, potentially undermining the privacy of those properties.

-The orientation and placement of the 7-story and 9-story Apartment and Hotel buildings was carefully studied to ensure the least impact on neighboring properties. It is also important to note that the owner of the nearest single-family home (mentioned above to be 175ft from the nearest 9-story building) has not objected to this application.

Consideration should be given to whether this scale of development is appropriate in this instance given the character of the area and the proximity of existing residential properties. Although ten storey buildings are becoming more common along the sevenmile beach corridor and in Camana bay, this proposal would be the tallest on the north sound coastline outside of a planned area development. Consideration should be given to the cumulative impacts of the proposed development in the context of the already proposed and potential development of the wider area, especially in relation to the viability of tourism as outlined in the socio-economics section above. With several new hotels proposed for development and currently under construction along the seven-mile beach corridor including the Grand Hyatt and hotel Indigo this project will add to the accumulation of hotel capacity for which the need should be suitably assessed.

The overall project, including the hotel has been carefully planned to embrace and enhance the surrounding properties. As explained in the Design Brief provided, the various elements, including the Hotel, have been situated in relation to similar elements, 7 like the existing Holiday Inn hotel, to provide a coordinated project that blends with its surroundings.

Conclusions

While the DoE does not recommend the proposed development be the subject of an EIA, there are potential significant impacts to the surrounding areas due to the excavation works to expand the canal areas, water quality issues relating to increased length of the canal, overshadowing, and overlooking of the neighboring properties, and traffic impacts. However, an EIA is not considered the most appropriate vehicle to assess these effects. The department of planning is developing the draft national planning framework which would include carrying capacity studies to examine and determine the potential growth within the seven-mile beach corridor which should be used to assess proposals such as this one. Similarly, the revised tourism plan for the Cayman Islands 2020 should be considered and give guidance to the suitability of a project like the proposed development.

The DoE recommends that a hotel needs assessment is carried out to determine the need for hotels in this area. We strongly recommend that this study is completed, and the results are reviewed prior to determining this planning application.

-As mentioned above, the proposed hotel, which is planned to be completed in 3 years, offers only 44 Boutique style guest suites. The Developer also has extensive experience in the hospitality sector and is confident that this product is appropriate for this location and will be welcomed as a positive addition to Cayman's tourism product.

In addition, water quality concerns associated with the extension to the existing canal and its impacts on water movement and flushing on the overall ecological health of the marine waters in the vicinity of the development should be addressed through the use of recognized flushing analysis models. Best practice would dictate that this should be required prior to determination of the application. However, if the CPA is minded not to require this in advance of determination, at a minimum it should be a condition of the planning permission.

-With regards to the existing canal and proposed extension the Developer was the original developer of the canal system and is mindful of any impacts this project might bring and will be using careful study and analysis of the approach and monitoring of the canal excavation. Finally, it's important to note that while the majority of Cayman is serviced by 30' roads, Crystal Harbour offers 50' road reservations. Crystal Harbour is also in the process of widening the main Crystal Harbour East access to allow for 2 entrances and 1 exit, which will ease any traffic concerns.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS

General

The subject property is located on Crighton Drive, generally across the street from the Holiday Inn.

The proposal is for the following:

- One nine storey hotel building with 44 rooms
- Five apartment buildings (total 58 units) – three that are seven storeys and two that are nine storeys
- Five three-storey duplexes
- Twenty three-storey townhouses in a total of five blocks
- One restaurant with owners lounge
- Area for future residential development
- Two storey parking garage and parking area (Parcels 145 & 146)
- Excavation of canal (basin)

A total of 219 parking spaces are required and 235 parking spaces have been provided. The majority of the proposed parking spaces (89) are on parcels 145 and 146. Six accessible parking spaces are proposed for the development.

Notification was served on landowners within 500 feet of the three properties and two advertisements were placed in a local newspaper. Objections have been received and are provided in the Appendix.

Zoning

The three properties are zoned Hotel/Tourism and Low Density Residential. The basin centred property is zoned Hotel/Tourism whereas parcels 145 & 146 are zoned Low Density Residential.

Specific Issues

1) Zoning

There are existing canals on the subject site which do not have a zone category. The applicant is proposing to fill in a portion of one of the canals and this is where about 85% of the hotel will be situated. The Authority will have to determine how to proceed with this element of the application that would not be subject to any zone provisions. The applicant has been advised of this issue and may have representations to make at the meeting in this regard.

The remaining portion of the hotel is in the LDR zone and the Authority must determine if this is an appropriate zone for a hotel. Regulation 9(3) states that tourism-related development may be permitted in suitable locations in a residential zone if the applications have been advertised twice in the newspaper and no objections are received that the Authority views as raising grounds for refusing permission. In this instance, there were two newspaper advertisements and objections were received, therefore the Authority must determine if those objections have raised sufficient grounds for refusing permission.

2) Parking & Sidewalks within Road Allowance

It is noted that some of the proposed sidewalks and parking spaces are located within the Crighton Road road allowance.

In general, the NRA and CPA typically require sidewalks and parking areas to be located within the property boundaries.

Land Limited, the registered owner of Crighton Road, has provided correspondence indicating that they have no objection to these features being located within the road allowance.

3) Combination of Parcels 145 & 146

Should the application be granted planning permission, the Department would recommend that the existing parcels for the proposed parking area and parking garage be combined into one parcel.

4) Canal Setback for Townhouses (4'10" vs 20')

Regulation 8(10)(ea) states that in areas where the shoreline is canal, all structures and buildings, including ancillary buildings, walls, and structures shall be setback a minimum of 20 feet from the physical canal edge.

The proposed townhouses will be setback a minimum of 4'10" from the edge of the canal.

The applicant has applied for a variance and submitted a variance letter.

5) Hotel Setback to Crighton Drive (9'5" vs 20')

Regulation 10(1)(h) requires a minimum 20 foot setback from the road edge or lot boundary.

It is noted that a portion of the proposed hotel building is setback 9'5" from Crighton Drive.

The applicant has applied for a variance and submitted a variance letter.

6) Duplex Setback from Canal (2'3" vs 20')

Regulation 8(10)(ea) states that in areas where the shoreline is canal, all structures and buildings, including ancillary buildings, walls, and structures shall be setback a minimum of 20 feet from the physical canal edge.

The proposed duplexes would be setback 2'3" from the canal edge.

The applicant has applied for a variance and submitted a variance letter.

3.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN MATTERS

4.0 PLANNING APPEAL MATTERS

5.0 MATTERS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

6.0 CPA MEMBERS INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

Appendix A

From: Judy Hurlston [<mailto:ujh1955@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 7:48 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Planning objection RE:Block 15E /95

I am writing this as an objection to a planning permission letter that was received from Tropical Architectural Group Ltd – Block and Parcel 15E95 owned by William Harold Pennington, Sharon Violet Meghoo, and Henry Harold Hurlston. Planning **Project # P21-1317.**

My objections are based on the fact that the proposed 4 story apartment complex will have a negative impact on my mother's property next door (Block and Parcel 15E 143) as well as my property across the street (Block 15 E 241).

In the planning permission letter no indication was made for the number of apartments only that it was a 4 story apartment building. This is of great concern as we have no idea the expected number of apartments/additional residents to the area.

To date my mother has yet to receive any notice of application for planning permission with regards to the building on 15E95.

My mother is 88 years of age, and copes with various health issues. Her health is failing her, but she will do whatever it takes to continue to live in her home of 60 years in peace and tranquility as she ages.

The proposed development is of great concern to us, as this development will change the nature of the area substantially with so many additional residents becoming her neighbors, increased noise level, privacy concern with a roof deck. Of great concern is the fact that the small Cayman Cottages(My mother next to this massive development) in the area will be completely compromised. These homes are occupied by elderly born Caymanians and were built in the sand 60-70 years ago. They will not be able to withstand the massive amount of sand removal that will be needed for this development. The seawall is of great concern as this will change the lay of the land and increase the possibility of further beach erosion. The proposed construction of the seawall is simply unthinkable! Everyone familiar with this area of beach in South Sound will know it is 15E/142,15E/143,and 15E95 and the general area that takes all the ocean wave action in storms, coldfronts etc. We have no reef protection. Any seawall would force all wave action to adjoining properties that will cause erosion that eventually will even take out the structures on these properties.

We are gravely concerned by the magnitude of development that is proposed and the negative effects it will have environmentally with the proposed seawall structure and basement on her home right next door.

This area of South Sound has become very busy with heavy traffic over the years with the increase of multiple apartment complexes this proposed development right next door will only further disturb her quality of life.

Further to this we are also concerned about the proposed construction site such as parking for the workers, the noise level, the heavy equipment trucks, the hours of work, and the garbage from the work site as we have a never ending problem with these items in relation to **the Mantras** that is being built across the street/next door. We have contacted planning with numerous complaints with regards to these problems during the building period and were told to call the police it was beyond their control. I cannot tolerate another building project and being subjected to such a stressful environment while in my home. It has been observed that some of these construction workers remain and sleep in their vehicles very near to the construction of the Mantras, so we consider their vehicles as their place of residence.

Thanks for your consideration.

Una Judy Hurlston

From: Hank Hurlston [<mailto:irmahurlston@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2021 3:26 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to the proposed building on 15E95

To whom it may concern

I Irma Josefa Hurlston joint owner of 15E234 along with my husband Hank Lyndon Hurlston object to the proposed building on 15E95 for the same reasons stated on my husband objections. Please reference his email for my objections along with photos sent.

Thanks for your kindest attention on this matter.

Regards,
Irma Josefa Hurlston

Mary Rovenia White
P. O. Box 30252
Grand Cayman KY1-1202
Cayman Islands

30 December 2021

Director of Planning
P.O. Box 113
Grand Cayman KY1-9000
Cayman Islands

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Objection to Notice of Application for Planning Permission on Block 15E Block 95

I am the owner of Block 15E Parcels 20 & 21. I have received the above-mentioned Notice of Application for Planning Permission on Block 15E Block 95 to construct a four-storey apartment complex ("the complex").

I object to this application for the following reasons:

1. **Undefined horizontal line:** There exists a horizontal dotted line approximately half-way through the complex which is undefined. I kindly request this information to be provided forthwith so that I can submit and further objections if an issue arises as a result of this new information.
2. **Setback/erosion concerns:** I note the demarcation of the mean high water mark in October of 2021, but I question this represents the mean high water mark and I ask that this concern is substantiated by the developer.
3. Following a closer look at the plans, it appears that the developers propose to locate the structure past the regulated setback from the mean high water mark on a sandy beach. Using the developers own calculations, the complex will sit approximately 75 feet from the high water mark. Not only is this against regulations, but also has the propensity to cause beach erosion, as evidenced by the Boggy Sand cabana dilemma, the Marriott and the Seven Mile Beach stretch that is now suffering from erosion.
4. The developers propose underground parking a part of which, using the developers' calculations, puts the parking garage, the deck and pool out past the permitted setback.

5. **Floor plans:** There needs to be a floor plan exhibited clearly demarking each bedroom, bathroom etc. The number of apartments proposed is 8. However, based on the figures on the plan the calculation, in which there appears to be a calculation error using the formula of 20×0.40 instead of the correct 15×0.40 which would equal 6 apartments instead of 8 apartments. If there are 8 apartments with a den which can be used as a bedroom, then there are 16 bedrooms and not 12, as allowed for the square footage of the property. This calculation negates the approval of 8 apartments.
6. **Coverage:** Although the plans state that the coverage is 22.27% (5358sq ft.) with an allowance of 30%, the ground floor, second, third and fourth floor each covers 4,000 square feet and the roof deck 4,008; there is a total of 6153sq ft for parking plus 4000sq ft for the basement. This is substantially more than the 5358 sq ft. Additionally, there appears to be a ramp which is not on the ground floor plan.
7. The developers say that the building is 54 feet high; this amounts to 5 stories not 4 as stated. Calculating that the parapet wall is measured at 50 feet high, it is unlikely that the roof top is only 4 feet higher than the parapet wall and clarification is also sought on this calculation as well.
8. The side elevation setbacks do not provide any measurements.
9. **Parking:** during the construction of "The Mantras" complex the employees were parking on my private property as there was no parking for them. I had to get my property fenced in order for this to discontinue. Where do the developers propose for parking during construction and after ?
10. The plan shows 13 parking spaces allotted which amounts to 1.5 spaces for 8 apartments and 1 accessible parking space. This means there will be no parking spaces allotted for delivery and guests. Even one-bed apartments used by a couple will need 2 spots for each having a car. No guests can park. No deliveries can be made with parking.
11. **Beach access/empty parcels - The Mantras:** The plans shows a vacant parcel "155" for the Mantras. This is not factually correct. The "vacant lot" shown on the plan are actually the entrance/exit to The Mantras and its inland complex, a 50-unit, 87-bedroom development well under way. It is owned Mr Samuel Thevasaeyan, the same (in truth) applicant for these proposed plans (this information is found under the heading "General Notes" on the plans).
12. The Mantras sold their complex units on the premise that they had access to an exclusive South Sound sandy beach access and it was this property that was advertised as the

"sandy beach"; however, a competing development owned by private land owners who are not the legal owners of The Mantras does not guarantee beach access to The Mantras. Clarification on this issue should be provided.

13. Increase in traffic: although the NRA previously declared (impossibly) that The Mantras would not increase traffic in South Sound, that was an obvious irrational decision as the size of the development obviously would lead to an inevitable increase in traffic. Although this may seem insignificant when comparing to a development of 6 or 8 units, there will be an increase of traffic that includes service and delivery agents and visitors.

14. For the reasons above I object to the development of this site.

I would be available to voice my objections at any further meeting as necessary.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Yours faithfully,


Mary Rovena White

Denise Couch
P O Box 31196
Grand Cayman KY1-1205
Cayman Islands

Tel: (345) 916-6298 • Email: couch_den@yahoo.com

29th December 2021

Director of Planning
P O Box 113
Government Administration Building
Grand Cayman KY1-9000
Cayman Islands

Dear Sirs,

Re: Proposed 4-storey apartment, etc. on Block 15E Parcel 341

With reference to the above Notice of Application for Planning Permission dated Friday, 10 December 2021.

I write as owner of Block and Parcel 15E 235 H14.

First, I must comment on the timing of the Notice for this project, as well as the 21 calendar days of the date of posting, stipulation placed, for objections and/or support being of insufficient time. Not only is the time frame insufficient to have bona fides independent studies done, but it's also during a period of multiple public holidays and when most professionals would have closed doors for at least ten days during the Christmas holidays.

Given the size of the property referenced are the proposed plans in full compliance of the Development and Planning Regulations (2021) Revision? With consideration to Regulation 15 and its various sectors.

The proposal is for a 4-storey building with basement and roof deck; are the basement and roof deck to be in addition to the proposed 4-storey apartment or included in the 4-storey, sited?

What is the water table level of the site? Will the proposed basement be mostly sited above the current road level?

Yours faithfully,



Denise Couch

Strata 15E 244

St. Tropez

PO Box 116

Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands

Tel (345) 929-7178

Email:

Matthewdiaz1@hotmail.com

January 6th, 2021

Director of Planning

PO Box 113

Government Administration Building

Grand Cayman, KY1-9000

Re: P21-1317 BLOCK 15E PARCEL 95
20,305 SQ. FT. 4-STORY APARTMENT; POOL; GENERATOR; ELEVATOR; (2)
SIGNS ATTACHED TO THE BUILDING/WALL; AND RETAINING WALL

Dear Sirs,

We refer to the Notice of Application for Planning referred to above dated 10th December, 2021.

We write as the owners of Block 15E 244 H25.

We are generally concerned about the increasing development of South Sound and the ever-increasing pressure on South Sound Road.

In relation to this application, our general comment is that the developers are trying to put too much building onto a small plot.

We would comment by reference to the Development and Planning Regulations (2021 Revision):

1. The site is .41 acres, Regulation 15(4)(a)(iii) states that for an apartment development there shall be a minimum lot size of .5 acre.
2. The lot width is only 94' at the road and tapers to approximately 82' at the retaining wall, Regulation 15(4)(d) in the Development and Planning (Amendment) Regulations 2021 requires the minimum lot width for apartment buildings to be 100'.

3. Regulation 8 (10) (f) requires "all structures and buildings, including walls and structures" to be a minimum of 75 feet from the High Water Mark (HWM) setback. The retaining wall and pool deck are clearly within the 75-foot setback.

We would additionally comment by reference to the Development Plan:

1. Regulation 15 (1) requires developers to have the appearance of residential development in scale and massing. The adjacent properties are low-density one and two-story homes.
2. Does the development meet the requirement of Regulation 15 (5) in relation to open space, gardens, and landscape? Aside from a slip of hedging, there is no tree scaping sited within the application.
3. Regulation 15 (3) imposes a maximum density of bedrooms which the site plan acknowledges would be 12 bedrooms. The floor plans describe the room by the entrance to each apartment as a "den" with an adjacent bathroom. It is not beyond reason that the purchasers will treat the apartments as two bedrooms, two bathroom apartments, thus breaking the density requirements.

Finally, we would like to comment on the beach at the rear of the property which is designated a critical turtle nesting habitat under the National Conservation Law. The beach width is constantly changing with the sea going up to the vegetation line while at other times the sand accumulates, and the beach becomes wide and thereby greatly changing the location MHW. The line of "permanent" vegetation is customarily used to determine a true baseline for measurement of the high water mark. A survey of the Parcel 95 late last year would have put the MHW at the vegetation line as can be deduced by the extension of the MHW on the neighboring parcels 15E, 142, 143, 123, and 124 shown on the site plan. Coastlines, and beaches, are dynamic fast-changing systems that are an important characteristic of our islands. The prudent use of coastal development setbacks, which establish a safe distance between the upper limit of wave action and new development, provides for beach preservation, reduction of erosion, as well as improved access, vistas, and privacy for beach users and property owners.

We have seen the impact of poor decisions in South Sound and we need to learn from these past mistakes.

Regards,



Matthew Diaz

For and on Behalf of

Strata 15E244

**DONNYBROOK
HOLDINGS LTD**

**PO Box 30513 Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands
KY1 1203**

Tel (345) 916 3554

Email:moon@candw.ky

December 30, 2021

Director of Planning
PO Box 113
Government Administration Building
Grand Cayman
KY1 9000

Dear Sirs

Re: Proposed 4 storey apartment etc on Block 15E Parcel 95

We refer to the Notice of Application for Planning Permission referred to above dated 10th December 2021.

I write as a Director of Donnybrook Holdings Limited, the owner of Block 15E Parcel 341.

To put our comments in context, we have lived close to the site of the proposed development for over 25 years.

We are generally concerned about the increasing development of South Sound and, amongst other issues, by the ever-increasing pressure on South Sound Road.

In relation to this application, our general comment is that the developers are trying to cram too much building onto too small a plot.

We would comment by reference to the Development Plan:

1. Does the proposed development meet the requirements and standards of Paragraph 3.03 of the Development Plan, particularly in respect to the guidance as to "appearance of residential development in scale and massing"?
2. Does the proposed development meet the "high standard of accommodation, amenities and open space" and "an abundant degree of lush, tropical landscaping, incorporating sufficient screening to provide privacy from adjacent properties" required by the Development Plan?
3. Is the proposed development "harmonious and compatible land use with adjacent properties" which are low density one and two storey homes along the seaside, that development of the site and area will possibly aid overly dense development for the zone, and is it an aesthetically pleasing development, designed with sensitivity towards heritage results (an oversized building in the middle of historic South Sound village?) all as guided by the Development Plan?

We would additionally comment by reference to the Development and Planning Regulations (2021 Revision):

1. Regulation 15 (4) (a) (iii) requires a minimum lot size for apartments of one half of an acre which is not met by the application.
2. Regulation 15 (4) (d) introduced by the Development and Planning (Amendment) Regulations 2021 requires a minimum lot width for apartment buildings of one hundred feet which is not met by the application.

3. Regulation 15 (1) requires development to have the appearance of residential development in scale and massing.
4. Is this location suitable for apartments under Regulation 15 (2)?
5. Does the development meet the requirements of Regulation 15 (5) particularly in relation to open space, gardens and landscaping?
6. Regulation 15 (3) imposes a maximum density of bedrooms which the site plan acknowledges would be 12 bedrooms. The floor plans describe the good size room by the entrance to each apartment as a "den", which enjoys an adjacent bathroom. It is not beyond reasonable speculation that purchasers will treat the apartments as two-bedrooms, two bathrooms apartments, and thus the density requirement will be breached by semantics.
7. Does the development meet the requirements of Regulation 8 (2) (f) that "no continuous vertical façade or elevation exceeds 25 feet or two storeys in height" ?

Finally, we would like to comment on the beach at the rear of the site. We have lived overlooking the beach for over 25 years and we have seen the annual changes in beach width. Sometimes the sea goes up to the vegetation line, as was the case a year ago and for the early part of this year (attached to our email is a photo of the beach taken last year), and sometimes sand accumulates, and the beach becomes wide (see second photo), as is the case now. The beach is very mobile and consequently the MHWL moves substantially. A survey of the land a year ago would have put the MHWL at the vegetation line of Parcel 95 which can be broadly deduced as an extension of the MHWL on the neighbouring parcels 15E 142, 143, 123 and 124 shown on the site plan. Parcel 95 does not have physical attributes that extend out towards the sea on the ground as it does on the site plan. We understand there is a basic legal principle that the Crown should not be easily deprived of property (land and the seabed below MHWL) given that Crown property is held for the public good.

Regulation 8 (10) (f) requires "all structures and buildings, including.....walls and structures" to be a minimum of 75 feet from high water mark (the shoreline is not iron shore), but on the site plan, the pool and walls are shown as 50 feet from the MHWL. The sea on the relevant photo would be crashing onto the retaining wall of the pool of the proposed development, and irrespective of any environmental impact on which no doubt the DoE is being consulted, it seems reasonable to ask the question whether a fully engineered sea wall would be needed for the pool not to be undermined, and not the simple retaining wall shown on the plans.

It may be appropriate to suggest that the proposed development be redesigned on a smaller scale that would be in keeping with the size of the Parcel, the area and to be in accordance with the Regulations and the Development Plan, although how the developers can overcome the Regulation 15 (4)(a)(iii) restriction on apartments is not clear to us.

Yours faithfully



Andrew S Moon
For and on behalf of
Donnybrook Holdings Limited

Appendix B



The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

4th Floor
Harrison Centre
42 North Church St.
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1 1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1 345 949-0003
james@medley@ksglaw.ky

www.ksglaw.ky

13 January 2022

Sent by: Email only

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")


We act for **Catherine & Sebastien Guilbard**, ("our Clients") the Interested party and registered owners of property located in Crystal Harbour and legally described as Block 17A, Parcel 157.

Our Clients wish to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a stylized, cursive-like font.

KSG Attorneys at Law

Hal Ebanks

From: sebastien.guilbard <sebastien@guilbard.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 9:36 AM
To: Hal Ebanks
Subject: Please let me know if you need anything else.

TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development**.

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, It is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. **Boat Traffic**

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property. We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. **Parking**

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property. The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict? With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.(1)(c) in a *Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. **Noise**

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. **Hotel Setback Variance**

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. **Commercial Use in a Residential Zone**

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site

coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.

- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Sebastien Guillbard
+1 (345) 3261014

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2022 8:39 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcels 170REM1, 145 and 146

From: Guy Manning | Campbells [mailto:GManning@campbellslegal.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 10:39 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcels 170REM1, 145 and 146

Dear Director of Planning,

I am the owner of Block 17A Parcel 352 in Crystal Harbour.

I am writing to object to the recent application for planning permission which has been made in respect of Block 17A Parcels 170REM1, 145 and 146 on the preliminary grounds set out below. In breach of Section 15(4) of the Development and Planning Act (2021 Revision) (the "Act") and Regulation 8(12A)(a)(iv)) of the Development and Planning Regulations (2021 Revision) (as amended) (the "Regulations"), I have not received notification of the application by certified mail (or otherwise) from the developers. Time has therefore not started to run for the purpose of objecting to the application. I only recently became aware of the proposed development through an article on Cayman News Service and my objections are based on the limited site plans and elevations published on www.planning.ky, without having had sight of any more detailed plans (including floor plans) which might have been submitted to but not published by the Department of Planning. I reserve the right to supplement and/or amend my preliminary grounds of objection upon being served with notice of the application in accordance with my statutory right and/or upon revised or additional plans being submitted.

My preliminary grounds of objection are as follows:

1. **The application as published is incomplete and therefore defective, and may contain various breaches of the Regulations**

If the plans published on www.planning.ky comprise the entirety of the submitted plans, they do not meet the requirements of the Regulations. For example:

- 1.1 no floor plans are shown on the application (Regulation 6(1)(a)(i));
- 1.2 the plans do not appear to show the water and sanitary drainage systems (Regulation 6(4)(f));
- 1.3 the plans do not appear to have been duly certified (Regulation 6(7));
- 1.4 the number of parking spaces cannot be determined (In particular (but without prejudice to the ground at 2.2 below) because the number of spaces in the multi-storey car park on Block 17A Parcels 145 and 146 is not specified), such that it is not possible to determine whether the application complies with

each of the applicable requirements as to the total number and location of parking spaces (Regulation 8(1));

- 1.5 the number of hotel rooms is not specified, such that it is not possible to determine whether the application complies with the applicable hotel parking requirements (Regulation 8(1)(vi)) or the limit on hotel rooms per acre (Regulation 10(1)(a));
- 1.6 the number of apartment rooms is not specified, such that it is not possible to determine whether the application complies with the applicable apartment parking requirements (Regulation 8(1)(viii)) or the limit on apartment rooms per acre (Regulation 10(1)(b));
- 1.7 as the number of hotel and apartment rooms are not specified and the number of parking spaces cannot be identified, it is also not possible to determine whether the total number of parking spaces is sufficient having regard also to the obligation to provide 30 dedicated parking spaces for the 5,569 sq ft restaurant and additional dedicated parking spaces for each detached house and duplex (Regulations 8(1)(li) and (vii));
- 1.8 the site coverage percentage on Block 17A Parcel 17OREM1 is not specified, such that it is not possible to determine whether the applicable maximum coverage has been complied with (Regulation 10(e)). It is noted that the corner plots at the west end of the Parcel are shown as being a vacant subdivision. No subdivision is mentioned in the plans. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project, but it is not possible to calculate the percentage of coverage because the necessary information has not been provided; and
- 1.9 the site coverage percentage on Block 17A Parcels 145 and 146 is not specified, such that it is not possible to determine whether the multi-storey car park and the parking area on Block 17A Parcels 145 and 146 exceed 75% of the area of those parcels, although they appear to do so (Regulation 8(1)).

2. Actual breaches of the Regulations

- 2.1 The parking areas proposed on Block 17A Parcels 17OREM1, 145 and 146 extend beyond the parcel boundaries and encroach into Crighton Drive. If Crighton Drive and the parcels are under common ownership that is irrelevant. Neither the Act nor the Regulations distinguish between publicly and privately owned roads for this purpose. The privately owned Crighton Drive is a road over which rights of way and access exist and the proposed encroachment on it is impermissible.
- 2.2 The multi-storey car park proposed on Block 17A Parcels 145 and 146 does not fall within the definitions in the Regulations of either "parking area" or "ancillary building". A "parking area" is defined as "an open space reserved for parking vehicles related to any building" (emphasis added). The multi-storey car park is a building, not an open space, and it is not related to any other building on those parcels (which are separate and distinct from Parcel 17OREM1); it is the only building. An "ancillary building" is defined as "a garage or other buildings or structure on a lot or parcel subordinate to and not forming an integral part of the main or principal building but pertaining to the use of the main building". The multi-storey car park is not subordinate to or pertaining to the use of a main building; it is the only building on those parcels (which, again, are separate and distinct from Parcel 17OREM1). The Regulations do not contemplate planning permission being granted to construct a multi-storey car park as the only building on a parcel in a Hotel/Tourism Zone.
- 2.3 The hotel encroaches on the 20 ft setback in breach of Regulation 10(1).
- 2.4 The duplexes are adjacent to the canal and therefore also encroach on the applicable setback.



4th Floor
Harbour Centre
42 North Church St
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1-1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1-345-949-0003
jameskennedy@ksglaw.ky

www.ksglaw.ky

The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

14 January 2022

Sent by: Email only

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 93) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")


We act for **IWII, Ltd, ("our Client")** the interested party and registered owner of property located in Crystal Harbour and legally described as Block **17A, Parcel 160.**

Our Clients wish to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a stylized, cursive-like font.

KSG Attorneys at Law

Hal Ebanks

From: Tim Bradley <tim@bradley.ky>
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Hal Ebanks
Cc: James Kennedy

TO: Director of Planning
Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development**.

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property. We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – Is there a potential for conflict? With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.(1)(c) in a *Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Tim Bradley on behalf of IIWII, Ltd.
[name of owner]

Kind regards,
Tim

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===



The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

Sent by: Email only

13 January 2022

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

We act for **Kieran & Michelle O'Mahony, ("our Clients")** the interested parties and registered owners of property located in Crystal Harbour and legally described as **Block 17A, Parcel 154.**

Our Clients wish to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please **do not hesitate** to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

4th Floor
Harbour Centre
42 North Church St
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1-1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1 345-949-0003
james.keene@ksglaw.ky
www.ksglaw.ky

Yours faithfully,

KSG

KSG Attorneys at Law



KIERAN AND MICHELLE O'MAHONY
YACHT CLUB VILLAS NO 4,
THE CAYMAN ISLANDS YACHT CLUB,
SEVEN MILE BEACH,
P.O. BOX 30835 GRAND CAYMAN KY1-1204,
CAYMAN ISLANDS

Thursday, January 13, 2021

Director of Planning

The Department of Planning
Cayman Islands Government
PO Box 111
Grand Cayman KY1-1203
CAYMAN ISLANDS

Dear Sir,

We, the co-owners of Block 17A, Parcel 154, wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(a)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and notes, *it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses.* This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the

KCM

Mobile: +1 345 966 1852

Home: +1 345 966 3864

Work (direct): +1 345 966 5721

10

Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4 storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High Lowers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development**.

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and lowering the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and

Cell: +1 (345) 326 3557

KOM

reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant - is this for the residences or the restaurant - is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg B.(1)(c) in a *Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the rooftop bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance.

§(13)(b)(i) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.11 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

KIM

7. **Commercial Use in a Residential Zone**

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.


Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage - presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell - no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to


Carl + L (345) 326 3447



January 13, 2022

further discuss.

Sincerely,



Kieran and Michelle O'Mahony

Co-owners of Block 17A; Parcel 154



4th Floor
Harbour Centre
42 North Church St.
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1-1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1-345-949-0503
james.kennedy@ksglaw.ky

www.ksglaw.ky

The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

Sent by: Email only

13 January 2022

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145, 146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

We act for **Nicola Davies, ("our Client")** the interested party and registered owner of property located at 52 Baccarat Quay and legally described as Block **17A, Parcel 159.**

Our Client wishes to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Hal Ebanks

From: Nicola Davies <davies.na57@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 9:30 AM
To: Hal Ebanks
Subject: Ref CH Development

TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.


Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot - it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development.**

13

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a stylized, cursive-like font.

KSG Attorneys at Law

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant - is this for the residences or the restaurant - is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.(1)(c) *In a Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

14

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the rooftop bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

B(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Nicola Davies

52 Baccarat Quay

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===

15



4th Floor
Harbour Centre
42 North Church St.
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1-1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1-345-949-0003
james.keenedy@ksqlaw.ky

www.ksqlaw.ky

The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

Sent by: Email only

13 January 2022

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

We act for **Cindy Annette Downing & Matthew Ian Downing**, ("our Clients") the interested parties and registered owners of property located at 25 Baccarat Quay and legally described as **Block 17A, Parcel 167.**

Our Clients wish to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Hal Ebanks

From: Ian Downing <idowning75@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 12:59 PM
To: Hal Ebanks
Cc: 2b095af62+matter1408456832@maildrop.clio.com
Subject: Re: Objection- Crystal Harbour Planning Application

Hi Hal

Please see text below as authorization per your fast email.

Thanks - sorry missed it last round. Been working off my mobile.

Ian and Cindy

Thanks for the confirmation on the other email Ian...

Can I kindly ask that you copy the text in the email (below the line) and send back to me, this will serve as your authorization for KSG to act for you and will be the objection which is appended to the letter you just reviewed.

Many thanks

Hal Ebanks



TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.


There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning

16

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a stylized, cursive-like font.

KSG Attorneys at Law

Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, *it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses*. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 1 /A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development**.

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bike lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

17

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.(1)(c) *In a Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration,

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.

- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

_____]]

[name of owner]

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Hal Ebanks <HalEbanks@ksglaw.ky>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022, 12:26 PM
To: Ian Downing
Cc: 2b095af62+matter1408456832@maildrop.club.com
Subject: FW: Objection- Crystal Harbour Planning Application

Thanks for the confirmation on the other email Ian...

Can I kindly ask that you copy the text in the email (below the line) and send back to me, this will serve as your authorization for KSG to act for you and will be the objection which is appended to the letter you just reviewed.

Many thanks

Hal Ebanks



4th Floor
Harbour Centre
42 North Church St.
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1 1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1-345-949-0003
j.kennedy@ksg.law.ky

www.ksglaw.ky

The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

13 January 2022

Sent by: Email only

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

We act for **IMAN SHAFIEI**, ("our Client") the Interested party and registered owner of property located at 53 Baccarat Quay and legally described as Block 17A, Parcel 164.

Our Client wishes to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a stylized, cursive-like font.

KSG Attorneys at Law

Hal Ebanks

From: Mohammad Sh <mh@odinsezc.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 2:47 PM
To: Hal Ebanks
Cc: iman@odinsezc.com
Subject: RE: Notice of application for planning permission- 11 Jan 2022
Attachments: 2022 01 11 Objection Letter Shafiei[1].docx

YES, information in the letter is correct, only change I made in the letter insert (53 Baccarat Quay) as our property location.

Regards,

Mahan Shafiei

TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development.**

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'lounging the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – Is this for the residences or the restaurant - Is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg B.(1)(c) in a *Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from

the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(i) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

MAN SHAFIEZ

53 Baccarat Quay

Block 17A Parcel 164

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===



4th Floor
Harbour Centre
42 North Church St.
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1-1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1-345-949-0003
james.sennedy@ksglaw.ky

www.ksglaw.ky

The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

Sent by: Email only

13 January 2022

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

We act for **Kenneth & Tanya Zemniak**, ("our Clients") the interested party and registered owners of property located in Crystal Harbour and legally described as **Block 17A, Parcel 86.**

Our Clients wish to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is appended to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a stylized, cursive-like font.

KSG Attorneys at Law

Hal Ebanks

From: Tanya Ziemniak <tanyaz1002@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 3:11 PM
To: Hal Ebanks
Cc: 2b095af62+matter1408456832@maildrop.clio.com
Subject: Re: Objection- Crystal Harbour Planning Application
Attachments: 2022 01 11 Objection Letter Zemniak.docx

Confirmed. Please submit on our behalf.

Tanya
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 13, 2022, at 3:00 PM, Hal Ebanks <HalEbanks@ksglaw.ky> wrote:

Hi Tanya,

Thanks for this.

Please see **attached** draft cover letter for your review.

Could you kindly confirm that you authorize KSG to submit the objection below on your behalf in this matter by email reply confirming the same.

Please reach out at any time if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

TO: Director of Planning
Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism

corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years. Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parces 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys. The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that high towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development**. If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats

coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property. We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.1(1)(c) *In a Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options

that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage - presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored? We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.

The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.

The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.

The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.

The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?

The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell - no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.

There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Kenneth & Tanya Zemnlak

Hal Ebanks

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===



4th Floor
Harbour Centre
42 North Church St
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1-1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1-345-942-0003
jameskennedy@ksqlaw.ky

www.ksqlaw.ky

The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

13 January 2022

Sent by: Email only

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

We act for **Gavin Baxendale, ("our Client")** the interested party and registered owner of property located at Baccarat Quay and legally described as **Block 17A, Parcel 161.**

Our Client wishes to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a stylized, cursive-like font.

KSG Attorneys at Law

Hal Ebanks

From: Gavin Baxendale <gavin_baxendale@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 3:18 PM
To: Hal Ebanks
Cc: Katherine Tatham; 2b095af62+matter1408456832@maildrop.clo.com
Subject: Re: Objection Letter
Attachments: image363691.png; image689344.png; image199236.png; image777677.png; 2022 01 11 Objection Letter Baxendale.docx

I can confirm, do you need me to sign anything?

On Jan 13, 2022, at 15:02, Hal Ebanks <halebanks@ksglaw.ky> wrote:

Hi Gavin,

Can you kindly review the attached draft cover letter, and confirm that you authorize KSG to submit the objection below on your behalf.

Kind regards

TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(c)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development**.

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'boating

26

the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.1(c) *in a Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage - presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell - no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Gavin Baxendale

Hal Ebanks

HalEbanks@ksglaw.ky
www.ksglaw.ky
Follow us:

4th Floor Harbour Centre, 42 North Church Street, George Town, PO Box 2255, KY1-1107, Cayman Islands

27

Confidentiality: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender immediately at the address shown above and delete the message from your computer without further action. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or any files transmitted with it by an unauthorized recipient is strictly prohibited.

"KSG Attorneys at Law" is the business name of KSG Attorneys Limited, a body corporate recognised under the Legal Practitioners (Incorporated Practice) Regulations (as revised). Services are provided on the basis of our current terms of business, which can be viewed at <http://www.ksglaw.ky/assets/pdf/TermsandConditionsKSG.pdf>

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===

FS



The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

4th Floor
Harbour Centre
42 North Church St.
P.O. Box 2255
Grand Cayman
KY1 1107
Cayman Islands

Tel: 1-345-949-9003
jameskennedy@ksglaw.ky

www.ksglaw.ky

13 January 2022

Sent by: Email only

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

We act for **Todon Charles Leshikar**, ("our Client") the interested party and registered owner of property located in Crystal Harbour and legally described as **Block 17A, Parcel 306**.


Our Client wishes to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

28

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a stylized, cursive-like font.

KSG Attorneys at Law

Hal Ebanks

From: TC Leshikar (KY) <tc.leshikar@pwc.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 8:46 AM
To: Hal Ebanks; James Kennedy
Subject: Objection- Crystal Harbour Planning Application

TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot - it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development.**

29

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – Is this for the residences or the restaurant – Is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.(1)(c) in a *Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use In a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage - presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell - no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

30

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

TODON Charles Leshikar

T.C. Leshikar

PwC | Partner, Tax

Office: 345-914-8616

Email: tc.leshikar@pwc.com

PricewaterhouseCoopers

18 Forum Lane, P.O. Box 258, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands KY1-1104

<http://www.pwc.com/ky>

^THIS DOCUMENT WAS NOT INTENDED OR WRITTEN TO BE USED, AND IT CANNOT BE USED, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING TAX PENALTIES THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON THE TAXPAYER

The information transmitted, including any attachments, is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited, and all liability arising therefrom is disclaimed. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===



The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

Sent by: Email only

13 January 2022

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145, 146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")


We act for **Shari Seymour**, ("our Client") the Interested party and registered owner of property located at Bacarrat Quay and legally described as **Block 17A, Parcel 166.**

Our Client wishes to register their objections to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

A stylized handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'KSG' in a cursive, interconnected style.

KSG Attorneys at Law

Hal Ebanks

From: Shari Seymour <shari276@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 10:44 AM
To: Hal Ebanks; James Kennedy
Subject: Objection - Crystal Harbour Planning Application

TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however, given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot - it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development.**

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately placed parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.(1)(c) *in a Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposed area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the clear clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Grighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

33

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Shari Seymour

Baccarat Quay
Block 17A Parcel 166

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===



The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

Sent by: Email only

13 January 2022

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

We act for **Katherine Tatham ("our Client")** the Interested party and registered owner of property located at 9 Baccarat Quay and legally described as Block 17A, Parcel 272.

Our Client wishes to register their objection to the above mentioned Planning Application and we request that this objection be read into the record of any hearing or meeting concerning this application.

Our Client's objections are based on the following principle concerns contained in the email that is **appended** to this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact our offices at any time if you should require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

KSG

KSG Attorneys at Law

HP

Hal Ebanks

From: Katherine Tatham <kmtatham@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 8:21 PM
To: Hal Ebanks; James Kennedy
Subject: Objection- Crystal Harbour Planning Application
Attachments: 2022 01 11 Objection Letter Tatham.docx

TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development, in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot - it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development.**

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant -- is this for the residences or the restaurant -- is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crighton Drive. We draw attention to Reg B.(1)(c) *in a Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac. of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

36

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE TATHUM

9 BACCARAT QUAY - 17A 272

PO BOX 76EE, KY1-1801

345-926-0242

===This email originated from outside the organization. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.===

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 11:31 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per

From: Tanya Ziemiak [mailto:tanyaz1002@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 11:04 AM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per t...

TO: Director of Planning

Dear Sir,

We wish to formally object to the proposed application for Planning permission (P21-1260) and wish for our complaint to be read into the record of any meeting.

We reserve our right to make further representations on this matter through our appointed legal counsel, KSG Attorneys at Law.

There are particular elements of the proposed development that we object to, as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

1. Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we invite the members of the Central Planning Authority ("the CPA") to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor which is undoubtedly intertwined with lower density residential areas.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned Low Density

37

Residential ("LDR") and separated from the Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot - it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. We respectfully submit that High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, **not a gated residential development.**

If CPA is minded to approve the development of the site in the proposed manner, it is clearly not in keeping with the characteristics of the neighborhood and the spirit of the legal framework underpinning development in the Cayman Islands.

2. Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we would ask that conditions be imposed to increase safety by improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

3. Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected creating a further nuisance to the existing owners and therefore diminishing or depriving them of their right to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property.

We would also like to have a full understanding of any Coastal Works Permits that may have been, or will be sought in relation to this development and reserve all rights to make representations on this aspect.

4. Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant? We submit this proposal will create a safety hazard for pedestrians on the property.

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, this will cause conflict with access for the residences due to the inherent

risk of mixing commercial traffic in a low density residential area. The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – Is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, this will likely force patrons to park on Crlghton Drive. We draw attention to Reg 8.(1)(c) in a *Neighbourhood Commercial zone or Hotel/Tourism zone, twenty-five per cent of the parking space may be located not more than five hundred feet from the respective building.*

5. Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights which again diminish the owners ability to peaceful enjoyment and privacy of their property.

6. Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

7. Commercial Use In a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations that we hereby ask that the CPA give its reasoned consideration.

- a. The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- b. The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.

- c. The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- d. The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- e. The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- f. The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- g. There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Tanya and Kenneth Ziemniak block and parcel 17A B6

Tanya
Sent from my iPhone

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 11:30 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] OBJECTION: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1

From: Samuel R. Banks [mailto:sam.banks@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2022 9:34 AM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OBJECTION: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1

The Director of Planning
Department of Planning
Government Administration Building
133 Elgin Avenue
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman,
Cayman Islands
KY1-9000

13 January 2022

Sent by: Email only; planning.dept@gov.ky

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Planning permission (Project No. P21-1260) on Block 17A, Parcels 145,146 and 170REM1 for the construction and associated development of "93 residential units and 44 hotel suites, for a total of 137 units broken down per the following (1) 9-story hotel, 95) Apartment Buildings (between 7/9 stories (10) Duplexes and (20) Townhouses and 2-story Garage/Storage building, Restaurant/Owners Lounge & Café and associated development and works...." ("the Application")

I would like to object to the above stated application on the following grounds:

Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we wish the CPA to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Although Regulation 8(2)(c)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned LDR and separated from the H/T zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-

shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-stories or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, not a gated residential development.

Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we'd like to see improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected.

Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant?

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, will this cause conflict with access for the residences? The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, will patrons then choose to park on Crighton Drive?

Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. Note the bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the rooftop bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights.

Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations.

- 1) The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- 2) The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- 3) The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- 4) The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- 5) The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- 6) The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- 7) There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

SAMUEL R BANKS DIRECTOR EPHESIAN CAPITAL

BLOCK: 17A PARCEL: 162

Samuel R. Banks, Jr. M.A. Applied Economics, LL.B. (Hons) Lond.
Attorney-at-Law

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information in this email may be confidential and/or legally privileged. This email is intended to be reviewed by only the individual or organization named above. If you are not the intended recipient or an

40

authorized representative of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination or copying of this email and its attachments, if any, or the information contained herein is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender by return email and delete this email from your system.

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Enrique Tasende <Enrique.Tasende@dart.ky>
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 10:49 PM
To: Popovich, Nicholas; Department of Planning
Cc: Marcela D'Alessio
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection letter

Good morning Mr. Popovich,

We have had an opportunity to better understand the proposal and wish to add onto our original objection which was emailed to you on January 10th.

There are particular elements of the development that we object to as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we wish the CPA to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Although Regulation 8(2)(c)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned LDR and separated from the H/T zone by Crichton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot -it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, not a gated residential development.

Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we'd like to see improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bike lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected.

Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant?

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, will this cause conflict with access for the residences? The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, will patrons then choose to park on Crighton Drive?

Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. Note the bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights.

Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations.

- 1) The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- 2) The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- 3) The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- 4) The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- 5) The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- 6) The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- 7) There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

Kind Regards,

Enrique and Marcela Tasende

owner of Block 17A Parcel 163

Enrique Tasende

Senior Vice President, Active Investments

Dart

T: +1345 8408431

M: +1345 32911993

O: +1345 6403800

E: enrique.tasende@dart.vc

PHYSICAL ADDRESS: 59 Nexus Way, Camana Bay, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands

MAILING ADDRESS: 10 Market St, #772 Camana Bay, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands KY1-9006

[Dart.ky](https://dart.ky) | [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

Please consider the impact on the environment before printing this email

On Tue, Jan 11, 2022 at 9:07 AM Popovich, Nicholas <Nicholas.Popovich@gov.ky> wrote:

Mr Tasende,

Thank you for the objection letter

I will pass your email on to the applicant

42

They may or may not reply

Objection letters will only be received until midnight on the 14 January

Therefore, your letter proposed to be submitted on the 21 January would not be presented to the CPA

I hope that helps

Nick

Nick Popovich M.PL, MCIP, RPP, AICP

Planning Officer | Current Planning



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
Cayman Islands Government

Government Administration Building

198 Elgin Avenue | George Town

P.O. Box 118 | Grand Cayman KY1-9000 | CAYMAN ISLANDS

+1 345 244-6501 (Main) | +1 345 244-6538 (Direct)

✉ nicholas.popovich@gov.ky | www.planning.gov.ky

This email, including any attachment, is strictly confidential and may also be subject to legal professional and other privilege. No confidentiality or privilege is waived by any error in its transmission. It is intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to and must not review, disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message or any part of it. If you have received this email in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately at the above email address or call 1-345-244-6548.

From: Department of Planning

Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 8:57 AM

To: Popovich, Nicholas <Nicholas.Popovich@gov.ky>

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection letter

From: Enrique Tasende [mailto:etase372@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 10:14 PM

To: Popovich, Nicholas <Nicholas.Popovich@gov.ky>; Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>; Marcela <chudal@yahoo.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection letter

You are hereby notified that an application for planning permission for the purpose of 90 residential units and 44 hotel units for a total of 132 units, broken down per the following: (1) 9-story Hotel, (5) Apartment Buildings (between 7-9 stories), (10) Duplexes, and (16) Townhouses. There is also a 2-story Garage Storage building, 3 lots assigned for single family homes, and an accessory structure containing a Restaurant, On-site Lounge & Bar, all connected via landscaped paths, courtyards, bridge, and public gardens, on Block 17A, Parcels 143, 146, and 150 REAR, near to Crablion Dr., and owned by LAND LTD. has been submitted to the Central Planning Authority (CPA), Grand Cayman.

The Application can be inspected at the Department of Planning, 115 Elena Avenue, The Government Administration Building, George Town, Grand Cayman. If you wish to object or support the application you should do so in writing stating your precise grounds within 21 CALENDAR DAYS of the date of posting. Your comments should be addressed to the Director of Planning, P.O. Box 113, Grand Cayman, KY 1-9600. Please include your return address (Typically a P.O. Box number).

Mr. Popovich,

I am the registered owner of Block 17A Parcel 163 and I lie within the notification radius for the above-referenced application. I wish to lodge an objection to the application in order to be able to present some concerns for the CPA to consider. I was able to view the application details earlier this week and given the complexity and scale of the proposal it may take a few days to sufficiently outline my concerns. I understand the last day to submit objections is Friday, January 14th and in the risk I'm unable to provide my full concerns by that date, I offer a few questions below for the applicant.

1. What is the anticipated phasing schedule? Where will construction operations be staged during each phase?
2. How will the access gates from Safehaven and Crystal Harbour south be managed?
3. What type of watersports will be offered by the hotel? Where will the vessels be parked?
4. Can you provide color renderings of the proposal (day and night). I'm particularly interested in any accent lighting.
5. It's not clear what works are proposed for the existing seawall and canal. How will dredging and construction of the duplex boat slips be managed?
6. Will the signature restaurant be open to the general public? Will it be a 3-meal restaurant? How will parking be managed as there does not appear to be any designated parking for this use.
7. Will the hotel pool bar be open to hotel guests only or the general public?

43

If the applicant chooses to respond to the above queries before the application is scheduled for CPA, I would appreciate receiving a copy.

I will be going over my notes in the next few days and will submit a formal letter no later than Friday, January 21", if that is acceptable.

Thank you,

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 11:40 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

From: philipr@rc-qs.com [mailto:philipr@rc-qs.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 11:15 AM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Dear Director of Planning:

We have had an opportunity to better understand the proposal and wish to add onto my original objection for Lot Owner Philip Ruffolo (Lot 17A-356).

There are particular elements of the development that we object to as well as items that appear to contradict the Planning and Development Regulations and Act.

Suitability & Building Height

We acknowledge that higher density housing and/or a hotel use can be approved for this site, however given the character of the neighborhood, we wish the CPA to consider what an appropriate scale may be for a mixed-use hotel development in an area off of the main tourism corridor.

After viewing the zoning map for the Crystal Harbour area, it seems this may be an anomaly for a past master plan that never came to be. This piece is now isolated, mainly surrounded by an established low-density residential neighbourhood.

Although Regulation 8(2)(e)(i) allows maximum buildings heights of 10 storeys/130' for apartments and hotels, it does not guarantee that height as a right nor does it guarantee any mixture of land uses. This is a unique site as it is located in a residential LDR subdivision. Yes, the land to the east is also zoned Hotel/Tourism, but it is along a long, natural shoreline. The H/T zone extends the entirety of the North Sound shoreline, while the remainder of Crystal Harbour is zoned LDR and separated from the H/T zone by Crighton Drive. This is an odd-shaped lot - it seems there might have been a larger master plan intended at one time that never came to fruition and thus this parcel remained vacant for years.

Building heights in this area are 3-storeys or less with the exception of an approved 4-storey apartment development destined for Block 17A Parcels 350 & 351. The only hotel use in the community is the Holiday Inn Grand Caymanian Resort which is only 3 storeys.

The applicant is correct, that this is one of the last large H/T pieces in the area, which means if it's approved for anything higher than 4 stories it will be the only tower and be out of character with the area. High towers are suitable in urban areas or area designed for high-density tourism such as Seven Mile Beach and George Town, not a gated residential development.

Traffic & Road Safety

Expanding the tourism within the residential subdivision will result in increased commercial traffic. The design offers nothing to mitigate the impacts, but instead we argue, is designed to worsen conflict.

Typically, a mixed-use and hotel development will have 1-2 access points from the road and offer an internal circulation system to direct guests. This proposal has 11 access drives. It is not designed to minimize traffic movements on a residential road. Crystal Harbour residents are able to walk, run and bike safely throughout the neighborhood. Children are able to safely visit friends without having to worry about speeding cars. Traffic is predictable and slow.

If CPA chooses to support this application, we'd like to see improvements made to Crighton Drive such as striping of traffic lanes, bikes lanes and sidewalks. It appears the existing right-of-width can allow for such road improvements.

Boat Traffic

Dockside parking is being offered for the signature restaurant, while not much appears to be offered for the hotel. Typically, a hotel with waterfront will offer watersports or charters, which we assume will occur for this proposal. This will introduce commercial boating activity through a residential canal system. There will be a parade of boats coming through, particularly on weekends impacting the residents' privacy and enjoyment of their property. An increase of noise and 'touring the canals' can only be expected.

Parking

It appears all of the restaurant and hotel parking are provided across Crighton Drive on residential lots Parcel 145 & 146. Are restaurant patrons expected to walk that distance to the restaurant?

The restaurant's taxi-turnaround area shares access with the duplexes and house lots. If the restaurant is successful, will this cause conflict with access for the residences? The parallel parking in front of the restaurant – is this for the residences or the restaurant – is there a potential for conflict?

With the lack of appropriately places parking, we fear the house lots will not be developed and instead be used for restaurant parking. This will increase traffic further within the subdivision, generating excess noise from vehicles, potential odors from car fumes, and head lights shining onto adjacent properties in the evenings. If the house lots are blocked from parking, will patrons then choose to park on Crighton Drive?

Noise

The hotel includes a rooftop bar and kitchen, which will be the first of its kind within a residential neighbourhood. Note the bar faces south onto the subdivision. The winds primarily come from the east and therefore the western properties will be negatively impacted by any sounds and odors coming from the roof top bar, restaurant, and any large group boating activities.

Any evening events will most likely have an impact on the neighbourhood with noise and lights.

Hotel Setback Variance

A small portion of the hotel encroaches the 20' road setback. The applicant claims the following exceptional circumstance to warrant the variance:

8(13)(b)(ii) unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.

We argue this is a self-imposed restriction. The site is large (5.31 acres) and vacant, there are no existing circumstances that prevent the hotel from complying with setbacks. There are a myriad of options that could be employed to allow all structures to comply with the setbacks.

Commercial Use in a Residential Zone

Reg 9(5) states "No use of land within a residential zone shall be dangerous, obnoxious, toxic or cause offensive odors or conditions or otherwise create a nuisance or annoyance to others". The ancillary parking lot with a two-storey commercial building is located on a parcel zoned LDR. We argue this use will create nuisance for nearby properties by increasing traffic movements on a residential road (3 driveways for a single occupancy use?) and not offering any buffer or screening to block headlights from shining on the road and adjacent properties.

Furthermore, the architectural style is a simple block, which is not in character with the community's residential nature. The second floor is to be used for office or storage – presumably to store necessary hotel stock and house administrative offices. Where will maintenance vehicles, landscape equipment and heavy machinery be stored?

We include a few other items that appear to be errors or conflict with Development & Planning Regulations.

- 1) The applicant states the proposal area is 7.54 acres, while it is in fact approximately 6.33 acres. It appears the applicant included the whole of Parcel 147 when calculating site coverage and density, however 0.84 ac of the Parcel is excluded from the site plan. Also to note that Parcel 147 is not listed as one of the parcels proposed for development.
- 2) The newspaper advert does not match the newspaper template provided in the Department of Planning's website. It does not provide for an email address to inquire about the application.
- 3) The newspaper advert and mailed notices make no mention of a canal extension or a residential subdivision.
- 4) The house lots do not comply with minimum lot size requirements per Regulation 10(1)(d). The applicant has not stated they were requesting lot size variances.
- 5) The architectural drawings do not include any details of the pedestrian bridge. What will the boat clearance be?
- 6) The hotel ground floor plan only provides a shell – no details as to whether a lobby bar/restaurant will be included, extent of administrative offices.
- 7) There are parking spaces that partially lie within the Crighton Drive right-of-way, as well as proposed sidewalks. It is our understanding that all elements of a development proposal shall lie within property boundaries, including sidewalks.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review and comment on this application. We look forward to receiving an invitation to appear before the CPA to further discuss.

From: philipr@rc-qs.com <philipr@rc-qs.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 11:06 AM
To: 'Planning.Dept@gov.ky' <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Here is my formal objection:

My name is Philip Ruffolo, owner of Block and Parcel: 17A-356 in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only In HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations, No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:

- 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
- 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
- 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
- 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
- 2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
- 3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.
 - 3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
 - 3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.
 - 3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.
- 4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
- 5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

From: philipr@rc-qs.com <philipr@rc-qs.com>
 Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 10:35 AM
 To: 'Planning.Dept@gov.ky' <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
 Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Hello,

I just wanted to confirm that my objection has been noted?

It is clear that this development violates several Hotel & Tourism rules regarding number of units per acre of land and site coverage.

Regards,
 Philip

From: Philip Ruffolo <philipr@rc-qs.com>
 Sent: Saturday, January 1, 2022 9:48 AM
 To: Planning.Dept@gov.ky
 Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Thanks. Please take this email as my objection to this plan.

----- On Wed, 29 Dec 2021 15:35:06 -0500 Planning.Dept@gov.ky wrote -----

Good afternoon Mr. Ruffolo,

Given that your property would fall within the required notification radius, you have the right to lodge an objection. You can simply email it to this address. We will acknowledge receipt and you will be invited to attend the CPA meeting when the application is considered where you will have an opportunity to voice your comments in person, or via Zoom.

Kind regards,

Ron Sanderson

Deputy Director of Planning | **Current Planning**

Department of Planning | Cayman Islands Government | Government Administration Building,

135 Elgin Avenue | PO Box 113, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands KY1-9070

☎ +1 345 244-6504 (Main) ☎ +1 345 244- 6501

✉ ron_sanderson@gov.ky | 🌐 www.planning.ky

This email, including any attachment, is strictly confidential and may also be subject to legal professional and other privilege. No confidentiality or privilege is waived by any error in its transmission. It is intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to and must not review, disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message or any part of it. If you have received this email in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately at the above email address or call 1-345-244-6501.



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
Cayman Islands Government

From: Philip Ruffolo [<mailto:philipr@rc-gs.com>]

Sent: Sunday, December 26, 2021 11:40 AM

To: Planning Info <info@planning.gov.ky>; Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Hello,

I own a lot neighboring this proposed development (lot 17A 356). Is there an opportunity for me to object to a 10-story building in my backyard?

Its not really clear on your website how I would go about doing this or if its possible. Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

Philip Ruffolo

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 11:40 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

From: philipr@rc-qs.com [mailto:philipr@rc-qs.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 11:06 AM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Here is my formal objection:

My name is Philip Ruffolo, owner of Block and Parcel: 17A-356 in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations. No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
 - 2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.
 - 3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.

3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.

3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.

5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

From: philipr@rc-qs.com <philipr@rc-qs.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 10:35 AM
To: 'Planning.Dept@gov.ky' <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Hello,

I just wanted to confirm that my objection has been noted?

It is clear that this development violates several Hotel & Tourism rules regarding number of units per acre of land and site coverage.

Regards,
Philip

From: Philip Ruffolo <philipr@rc-qs.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 1, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Planning.Dept@gov.ky
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Thanks. Please take this email as my objection to this plan.

----- On Wed, 29 Dec 2021 15:35:06 -0500 Planning.Dept@gov.ky wrote -----

Good afternoon Mr. Ruffolo,

Given that your property would fall within the required notification radius, you have the right to lodge an objection. You can simply email it to this address. We will acknowledge receipt and you will be invited to attend the CPA meeting when the application is considered where you will have an opportunity to voice your comments in person, or via Zoom.

Kind regards,

Ron Sanderson

Deputy Director of Planning | **Current Planning**

Department of Planning | Cayman Islands Government | Government Administration Building,

135 Elgin Avenue | PO Box 115, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands KY1-9000

☎ +1 345 244-6504 (Main) ☎ +1 345 244-6501

✉ ron.sanderson@gov.ky | 🌐 www.planning.ky

This email, including any attachment, is strictly confidential and may also be subject to legal professional and other privilege. No confidentiality or privilege is waived by any error in its transmission. It is intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to and must not review, disclose, copy, distribute or retain the message or any part of it. If you have received this email in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately at the above email address or call 1-345-244-6504.



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
Cayman Islands Government

From: Philip Ruffolo [mailto:philipr@rc-gs.com]

Sent: Sunday, December 26, 2021 11:40 AM

To: Planning Info <info@planning.gov.ky>; Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] P21-1260 objection

Hello,

I own a lot neighboring this proposed development (lot 17A 356). Is there an opportunity for me to object to a 10-story building in my backyard?

Its not **really clear on your website** how I would go about doing this or if its possible. Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

Philip Ruffolo

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 8:57 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection letter

From: Enrique Tasende [mailto:etase372@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 10:14 PM
To: Popovich, Nicholas <Nicholas.Popovich@gov.ky>; Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>; Marcela <chudal@yahoo.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection letter

You are hereby notified that an application for planning permission for the purpose of 93 residential units and 24 hotel suites, for a total of 117 units, broken down per the following: (1) 5-story Hotel, (5) Apartment Buildings (between 7-9 stories), (10) Clinics, and (10) Townhouses. There is also a 3-story Garage Storage building, 5 lots zoned for single family homes, and an existing structure containing a Restaurant, Owner's Lounge & Cafe, all connected via landscaped paths, courtyards, bridge, and public gardens, on Block 17A, Parcels 145, 146, and 147B(1), near to Crighton Dr., and owned by LAND LTD., has been submitted to the Central Planning Authority (CPA), Grand Cayman.

The Application can be inspected at the Department of Planning, 135 Elgin Avenue, The Government Administration Building, George Town, Grand Cayman. If you wish to object or support the application you should do so in writing stating your precise grounds within 21 CALENDAR DAYS of the date of posting. Your comments should be addressed to the Director of Planning, P.O. Box 113, Grand Cayman, KY 1-9000. Please include your return address (typically a P.O. Box number).

Mr. Popovich,

I am the registered owner of Block 17A Parcel 143 and I lie within the notification radius for the above-referenced application. I wish to lodge an objection to the application in order to be able to present some concerns for the CPA to consider. I was able to view the application details earlier this week and given the complexity and scale of the proposal it may take a few days to sufficiently outline my concerns. I understand the last day to submit objections is Friday, January 14th and in the risk I'm unable to provide my full concerns by that date, I offer a few questions below for the applicant.

1. What is the anticipated phasing schedule? Where will construction operations be staged during each phase?
2. How will the access gates from Safehaven and Crystal Harbour south be managed?
3. What type of watersports will be offered by the hotel? Where will the vessels be parked?
4. Can you provide color renderings of the proposal (day and night). I'm particularly interested in any accent lighting.
5. It's not clear what works are proposed for the existing seawall and canal. How will dredging and construction of the duplex boat slips be managed?
6. Will the signature restaurant be open to the general public? Will it be a 3-meal restaurant? How will parking be managed as there does not appear to be any designated parking for this use.
7. Will the hotel pool bar be open to hotel guests only or the general public?

If the applicant chooses to respond to the above queries before the application is scheduled for CPA, I would appreciate receiving a copy.

I will be going over my notes in the next few days and will submit a formal letter no later than Friday, January 21st, if that is acceptable.

Thank you,

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 8:56 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

From: Suzy Hanna [mailto:suzyhanna@me.com]
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 9:05 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

My name is Dr. Suzy Hanna, owner of Block and Parcel: 17A-38 in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A
Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations, No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
 - 2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.
 - 3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.

3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.

3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application

Dr. Suzy Hanna



Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 2:22 PM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection to Project No:P21-1260 Block:17A Parcel: 170REM1

From: rosaleen.corbin@gmail.com [mailto:rosaleen.corbin@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 1:44 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to Project No:P21-1260 Block:17A Parcel: 170REM1

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to [PROJECT NO.P21-1260](#), Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

My name is **M. Rosaleen Corbin**, owner of West Bay Beach North Block, Parcel: **17A / 33** in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 stories or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 stories. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 stories being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations, no floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel, the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
 - 2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.

3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.
 - 3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
 - 3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.
 - 3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.
4. If variances are requested, they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

With thanks for considering my objections.

M Rosaleen Corbin
rosaleen.corbin@gmail.com



KIERAN AND MICHELLE O'MAHONY
YACHT CLUB VILLAS, NO. 4,
THE CAYMAN ISLANDS YACHT CLUB,
SEVEN MILE BEACH,
P.O. BOX 30835 GRAND CAYMAN KY1-1204,
CAYMAN ISLANDS

The Director of Planning
The Department of Planning
Cayman Islands Government
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman KY1-9000
CAYMAN ISLANDS

E: planning.dept@gov.ky
E: info@planning.gov.ky

Sunday, January 09, 2022

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 - Crystal Harbour - Mega development - "Prisma" - (the "Proposal").

My name is **Michelle O'Mahony**, co-owner of Block: **17A** and Parcel: **154** in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the Proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows for 5 storeys or 65' heights in general Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 does it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should require the developer to inform the applicable zoning designation to the public.
2. I believe the application to be incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations with the number of floor plans shown. on this application. The following information is, I believe, required. as per below:
 - a. A site analysis with details/information on property size.
 - b. Detailing the number of units and the number of bedrooms
 - c. Detailing hotel bedroom numbers.
 - d. Detailing the number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant.

For 13,336 sf of restaurant, I understand that a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the hotel the developer is required to

Mobile: +1 345 326-3557

Home: +1 345 916-3304

Work (Direct): +1 345 914-5721

provide parking as per number of rooms however this analysis has not been provided.

- a. I understand that site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws. This detail does not appear to be provided to the public on this application.

3. In hotel tourism, I understand, the minimum roadside/front and as well, the minimum rear setback is 25 ft. As per the proposed plans it is noted, I understand, that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft, as is required.

- a. The parking areas, it appears, that are proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
- b. The hotel is already, it appears, encroaching on a 20 ft setback. This encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. (as it should be for this zone).
- c. It appears, that the duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft set back for total tourism on the north canal.
- d. If variances are requested, it appears that they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.

The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown as being both vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been provided on this application.

Over all, from what is available to see, this proposal is a high density, "mega" development. It is not at all in keeping with the nature, scale and aesthetics of the Crystal Harbour neighbourhood. When we bought our property in September of 2009, the reference point for what constituted "hotel/tourism" in the area was the "Holiday Inn". This proposed mega development is no Holiday Inn in its size, its density, its height and the impact that it will have on a quiet residential neighbourhood. It will, if approved in its current form, negatively impact the entire Crystal Harbour area – from an aesthetics and scale point of view. Further it will cause significant traffic flow/jams with associated noise and air pollution, as well as change the very fabric of Crystal Harbour from a predominantly family orientated neighbourhood to a tourist trap. Resident, but especially children and older people will not be safe playing and walking in the neighbourhood due to the significant increased traffic flow.


I find the whole application process to be opaque with inadequate detail provided. This is not a good harbinger of the type development we would want in our vicinity.

I further object to that tried and tested method of posting out proposed planning notifications to impacted neighbours just before the Christmas period in order that the Holiday Season will reduce the numbers of property owners picking up their post and responding to the proposal. This smacks of trickery, plain and simple. It is a ruse used to disadvantage property owners in the neighbourhood, irrespective of whether it is technically within the provisions of the law.

This proposal is completely at odds with what is currently "Crystal Harbour" and should on these grounds not be approved.

January 9, 2022

Sincerely,



Michelle O'Mahony

Email: Michelle_Kman@candw.ky



KIERAN AND MICHELLE O'MAHONY
YACHT CLUB VILLAS, NO. 4,
THE CAYMAN ISLANDS YACHT CLUB,
SEVEN MILE BEACH,
P.O. BOX 30835 GRAND CAYMAN KY1-1204,
CAYMAN ISLANDS.

The Director of Planning
The Department of Planning
Cayman Islands Government
PO Box 113
Grand Cayman KY1-9000
CAYMAN ISLANDS

E: planning.dept@gov.ky
E: info@planning.gov.ky

Sunday, January 09, 2022

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 - Crystal Harbour - Mega development - "Prisma" - (the "Proposal").

My name is **Kieran O'Mahony**, co-owner of Block: **17A** and Parcel: **154** in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the Proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows for 5 storeys or 65' heights in general Hotel/Tourism ("H/T") areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 does it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should require the developer to inform the applicable zoning designation to the public.
2. I believe the application to be incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations with the number of floor plans shown, on this application. The following information is, I believe, required, as per below:
 - a. A site analysis with details/information on property size.
 - b. Detailing the number of units and the number of bedrooms
 - c. Detailing hotel bedroom numbers.
 - d. Detailing the number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant.For 13,336 sf of restaurant, I understand that a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the hotel the developer is required to

54
KOH

- provide parking as per number of rooms however this analysis has not been provided.
- e. I understand that site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws. This detail does not appear to be provided to the public on this application.
3. In hotel tourism, I understand, the minimum roadside/front and as well, the minimum rear setback is 25 ft. As per the proposed plans it is noted, I understand, that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft, as is required.
- a. The parking areas, it appears, that are proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
 - b. The hotel is already, it appears, encroaching on a 20 ft setback. This encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. (as it should be for this zone).
 - c. It appears, that the duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft set back for total tourism on the north canal.
 - d. If variances are requested, it appears that they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.

The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown as being both vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been provided on this application.

Over all, from what is available to see, this proposal is a high density, "mega" development. It is not at all in keeping with the nature, scale and aesthetics of the Crystal Harbour neighbourhood. When we bought our property in September of 2009, the reference point for what constituted "hotel/tourism" in the area was the "Holiday Inn". This proposed mega development is no Holiday Inn in its size, its density, its height and the impact that it will have on a quiet residential neighbourhood. It will, if approved in its current form, negatively impact the entire Crystal Harbour area – from an aesthetics and scale point of view. Further it will cause significant traffic flow/jams with associated noise and air pollution, as well as change the very fabric of Crystal Harbour from a predominantly family orientated neighbourhood to a tourist trap. Resident, but especially children and older people will not be safe playing and walking in the neighbourhood due to the significant increased traffic flow.

I find the whole application process to be opaque with inadequate detail provided. This is not a good harbinger of the type development we would want in our vicinity.

I further object to that tried and tested method of posting out proposed planning notifications to impacted neighbours just before the Christmas period in order that the Holiday Season will reduce the numbers of property owners picking up their post and responding to the proposal. This smacks of trickery, plain and simple. It is a ruse used to disadvantage property owners in the neighbourhood, irrespective of whether it is technically within the provisions of the law.

This proposal is completely at odds with what is currently "Crystal Harbour" and should on these grounds not be approved.

Kieran

Sincerely,



Kieran O'Mahony
Email: KieranKman@me.com

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 9:43 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Prisma - Crystal Harbour - Letter of Objection to the Development
Attachments: 2022-01-09 Letter Of Objection to PRISMA Crystal Harbour 1.pdf

From: Kieran O'Mahony [mailto:kierankman@me.com]
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 7:11 AM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>; Planning Info <Info@planning.gov.ky>
Cc: Michelle O'Mahony <Michelle_Kman@candw.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Prisma - Crystal Harbour - Letter of Objection to the Development

Dear Director of Planning,

Please find attached a letter of objection to the proposed development to build 93 residential units, 44 hotel Suites, a 9 story hotel, 5x apartment buildings at 7/9 stories, 10x duplexes, and 20 townhouses, also a 2 story garage/ storage, 5 residential lots and amenities (including a restaurant) on blocks 17A145/146/170REM1 in Crystal Harbour.

This mega development is completely out of character with the residential, family neighbourhood that is Crystal Harbour and would significantly, negatively impact my property at Block 17A; Parcel 154.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter of objection/email.

Thank you.

Regards,
Kieran

Kieran O'Mahony
kierankman@me.com

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 9:43 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Development Proposal for Block 17A Parcel 170REM1

From: Nicholas Teasdale [mailto:ntcasdale@mc.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 9, 2022 4:49 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Development Proposal for Block 17A Parcel 170REM1

My name is **Nicholas Teasdale**, owner of Block **17A, Parcel 34** in Crystal Harbour.
I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A, Parcel 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows for 5 stories or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1. This is a neighborhood of 2 stories family homes, which is completely inconsistent with the neighborhood, and if it was it must be a mistake and it should be rectified. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 story buildings being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform the public and not allow construction above 5 stories that is already completely outside the range of homes of the neighborhood in which it is located.
2. The application is incomplete and what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations. No floor plans are shown on this application, and neither is the following information normally required:
 - A site analysis with information for property size.
 - Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - Number of bedrooms in hotel.
 - Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer it would be required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however this analysis has not been provided.
 - The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.

- The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line, this must not be accepted, the property should be self-contained for its own parking spaces as required by the regulation and there should not be a property that is designated single family residential used for a parking building.
- The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.
- The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

4. If variances are requested, they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

We purchased our home in Crystal Harbour based on the belief that it was a residential neighborhood with only 2-3 story homes. Crystal Harbour is a quiet and family friendly neighborhood with low density. Bringing this huge development will radically change the nature of the neighborhood and certainly the traffic within it.

The proposed development will bring a much high density of population to our neighborhood but also traffic and also cars parked everywhere on the roads (as there is not enough parking space on the proposal considering the amount of units). Significantly higher densities and increased traffic will impact not only impact on the quality of life but also on the safety of our kids who ride their bikes and walk their dogs.

I'm very surprised that an application for a project of this scope is being considered by the planning department when so much information about the development is missing.

If there is a separate parking in a separate parcel being considered, this should not be considered as a separate application, under which it is more than clear that a parking building cannot be approved in a single family designated parcel.

Given all that is expressed above I strongly encourage you to reject this application which should be sent back to the drawing board.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Teasdale

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 9:42 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO PROJECT NO. P21-1260, BLOCK 17A PARCEL 170REM1

From: Tanya Jamieson [mailto:tannyfoo2u@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 9, 2022 11:57 AM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Cc: Ian Jamieson <Ian.Jamieson@bedellcrstn.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO PROJECT NO. P21-1260, BLOCK 17A PARCEL 170REM1

Dear Sir/Madam - Director of Planning

Our names are Ian Jamieson and Tanya Jamieson, the owners of Block 17A Parcel 318 in the Crystal Harbour neighbourhood. We wish to submit our objections to the planning application P21-1260. Below is a list of grounds of objection:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should request that the developer inform the public appropriately.
2. The application is incomplete. There is only a site plan and elevations. There are no floor plans shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 3. 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 4. 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 5. 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 6. 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
3. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
4. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.
 - 4a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
 - 4b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.

58

4c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

5. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
6. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project, but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.
- 7.
8. In summary, the area of Crystal Harbour is a very quiet residential area. We purchased land and are in the process of building a family home in Crystal Harbour. We are complying with the Crystal Harbour covenants ourselves in ensuring our own home is limited in size and height and to hear now that a huge multiple storey and high density development is now being planned just a few roads away is not we believe in compliance with and/or not reflective of current planning guidelines for this area. There is an existing hotel in the neighbourhood, The Holiday Inn, across the road from this planned development however it is significantly set back from the road and is in keeping with height restrictions and precedents of the neighbourhood and respects the general quiet residential feel of the area. There is no precedent in Crystal Harbour that allows for such large and dense structures which will effectively tower over neighbouring homes and which will impose on their quiet enjoyment and privacy. The increase in traffic due to the level of condensing of units into this plot of land will have a detrimental effect on traffic flows and continuing damage to existing estate roads, which were not built for and are not conditioned for such heavy traffic. This is both in the short term as the property is being built but also in the long term with increased density on such a small piece of land. We also have reservations based on our understanding of the developer's history with previous developments, i.e. that what is submitted to planning will not be adhered to, to the detriment of neighbouring properties and the environment.

Many thanks.

Ian Jamieson and Tanya Jamieson
Owners of Block 17A Parcel 318

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 9:58 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

From: Gonzalo Jalles [mailto:gjalles@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 3, 2022 1:42 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to [PROJECT NO.P21-1260](#), Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

My name is **Gonzalo Jalles**, co-owner of Block and Parcel: **17A 85** in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 stories or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1. This is a neighborhood of 2 stories family homes, for sure this could have not been designated to build above 5 stories and if it was it must be a mistake that should be rectified. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public and not allow construction above 5 stories that is already completely outside the neighborhood in which is located.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations, No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the

developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.

2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.

3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.

3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line, this must not be accepted, the property should self contain its own parking spaces as required by the regulation and there should not be a property that is designated single family residential used for a parking building.

3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.

3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

On top of all the above, when we bought our lot many years ago, we specifically asked about the lot in objection and we were told that nothing too big or tall was going to be built as this area is a residential area.

Crystal Harbour is a quiet and family friendly neighborhood with low density, bringing this huge development will be totally against the idea of what it is right now as it will bring a very high density and also cars parked everywhere on the roads (as there is not enough parking space on the proposal considering the amount of units); it will also bring a lot more traffic and danger to the safety we have now for kids to ride bike and walk dogs.

I'm very surprised that an application for a project is accepted by the planning department when so much information about the development is missing.

If there is a separate parking in a separate parcel that should be considered as a separate application, under which is more than clear that a parking building can not be approved in a single family designated parcel.

Given all that is expressed above I strongly encourage you to reject this application which needs to go back to the drawing board.

Sincerely,

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 9:58 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

From: Brooks, Gregory [mailto:gregory.brooks@rbc.com]
Sent: Monday, January 3, 2022 12:32 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Cc: Greg Brooks <gregbrooks@me.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

My name is Gregory Brooks, owner of Block 17A and Parcel 78 in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.

2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations. No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:

- 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
- 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
- 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
- 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant.

For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces.

For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.

2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.

3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.

3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.

61

3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone. 3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.

5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

Please do let me know if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Gregory Brooks
916 5848
PO BOX 1140
KY1 9006

This [email] may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this [email] or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you received this [email] in error, please advise the sender (by return [email] or otherwise) immediately. You have consented to receive the attached electronically at the above-noted address, please retain a copy of this confirmation for future reference.

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 9:58 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

From: Rebekah Brooks [mailto:rebekah@candw.ky]
Sent: Monday, January 3, 2022 12:22 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to **PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1**

My name is **Rebekah Brooks**, owner of **Block 17A and Parcel 78** in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for **Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1** on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations. No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
 - 2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.
 - 3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
 - 3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.
 - 3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.
4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant

plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

Please do let me know if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Rebekah Brooks

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 9:58 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

From: Nicola Davies [mailto:davies.na57@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 2, 2022 2:39 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

Dear Director of Planning,

Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

My name is Nicola Davies, owner of Block and Parcel: 17A Parcel: 159, in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations. No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
 - 2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.
 - 3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
 - 3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.

3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

Kind regards
Nicola Davies

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

From: Darlee Ebanks [mailto:darlee@candw.ky]
Sent: Sunday, January 2, 2022 1:51 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NO.P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to **PROJECT NO.P21-1260**, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

My name is **Darlee Ebanks** owner of Block and Parcel: **17A 165** in Crystal Harbour.

I herby submit my objection to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only In HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations, No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms.
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking

64

spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.

2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.

3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.

3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.

3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.

3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.

5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

I trust you will take my objection into consideration and deny permission for this development.

May you be so kind as to confirm receipt of my email.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.

Darlee Ebanks

Sent from my iPhone

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Objection to project number P21-1260

From: gisela gamba [mailto:gisela.gamba@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 2, 2022 11:15 AM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to project number P21-1260

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to **PROJECT NO.** P21-1260, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

My name is **Gisela Gamba Fernandez**, co-owner of Block and Parcel: **17A 85** in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations, No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.

65

2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.

3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.

3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.

3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.

3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.

4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

On top of all the above, when we bought our lot many years ago, we specifically asked about the lot in objection and we were told that nothing too big or tall was going to be built as this area is a residential area.

Crystal Harbour is a quiet and family friendly neighborhood with low density, bringing this huge development will be totally against the idea of what it is right now as it will bring a very high density and also cars parked everywhere on the roads (as there is not enough parking space on the proposal considering the amount of units); it will also bring a lot more traffic and danger to the safety we have now for kids to ride bike and walk dogs.

I'm very surprised that an application for a project is accepted by the planning department when so much information about the development is missing.

I hope you take this objection seriously as this proposal is very incomplete.

Sincerely,

Gisela Gamba Fernandez

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: Objection to PROJECT NUMBER -P21-1260 BLOCK 17A- PARCEL 170 REM1

From: R. Steinsky [mailto:rsteinsky@steinskyenterprises.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 2, 2022 9:32 AM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Cc: R. Steinsky <rsteinsky@steinskyenterprises.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to PROJECT NUMBER -P21-1260 BLOCK 17A- PARCEL 170 REM1

Dear Mr. Pandohie,

Re: Objection PROJECT NUMBER P21-1260, BLOCK 17A PARCEL 170REM1

My name is **Rudolph Steinsky**, co owner of Parcel: **17A30** in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for **Block 17A**
Parcel: 170REM1 based on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only In HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations, No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
 - 2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.

66

- 3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
- 3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.
- 3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.
- 4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
- 5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

Thank you for your consideration,
Rudolph Steinsky

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Department of Planning
Sent: Thursday, December 30, 2021 4:11 PM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL]

And so it begins

From: TC Leshikar (KY) [mailto:tc.leshikar@pwc.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 30, 2021 3:48 PM
To: Department of Planning <Planning.Dept@gov.ky>
Subject: [EXTERNAL]

Dear Director of Planning,

Re: Objection to **PROJECT NO. P21-1260**, Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1

My name is **TOdon Leshikar**, owner of Block and Parcel: **17A 306** in Crystal Harbour.

I would like to object to the proposal of the plan for Block 17A Parcel: 170REM1 on the following grounds:

1. Hotel tourism allows 5 storeys or 65' heights in general hotel Tourism areas and only in HT zone 1 and 2 it permits 10 storeys. The application does not specify if this property is Zone 1 or 2 to allow for the 7 and 9 storeys being proposed. The Department of Planning should enforce the developer to inform this to the public.
2. The application is incomplete as what has been made available to the public is only a site plan and elevations, No floor plans are shown on this application, neither information required as per below:
 - 2a. A site analysis with information for property size.
 - 2b. Number of units with number of bedrooms
 - 2c. Hotel number of bedrooms.
 - 2d. Number of parking spaces proposed for the hotel and the restaurant. For 13,336 sf of restaurant a developer is required to provide 67 parking spaces. For the Hotel the developer is required to provide parking as per number of rooms however the analysis has not been provided.
 - 2e. The site coverage should not exceed 40% of the property size as per planning laws and the numbers are not shown on this application.
3. In Hotel tourism the minimum road and rear setback is 25 ft. As per proposed plans it is noted that on Crighton Drive the setback proposed is 20 ft and not 25 ft as required.
 - 3a. The parking areas proposed on Crighton Drive are outside of the property line.
 - 3b. The hotel is encroaching on a 20 ft setback, the encroachment will be even more on a setback of 25 ft. As it should be for this zone.
 - 3c. The duplexes, as proposed, are encroaching into the setback of 25 ft for Hotel tourism on the north canal.
4. If variances are requested they have not been mentioned on the notification to the public.
5. The corner plots at the west end of the property are shown vacant and as a subdivision. This subdivision is not mentioned on the notification letter. Deducting the area of the proposed

67

vacant plots increases the density of the proposed project but again calculations have not been displayed on this application.

T.C. Leshikar

PwC | Partner, Tax

Office: 345-914-8616

Email: tc.leshikar@pwc.com

PricewaterhouseCoopers

18 Forum Lane, P.O. Box 258, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands KY1-1104

<http://www.pwc.com/ky>

^THIS DOCUMENT WAS NOT INTENDED OR WRITTEN TO BE USED, AND IT CANNOT BE USED, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING TAX PENALTIES THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON THE TAXPAYER

The information transmitted, including any attachments, is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited, and all liability arising therefrom is disclaimed. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Popovich, Nicholas

From: Pandohie, Haroon
Sent: Thursday, December 30, 2021 2:22 AM
To: Popovich, Nicholas
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Planning objection

Dear Nick,

Please see below letter of objection.

With kind regards,

Haroon Pandohie, MCRP, MBA, AICP
Director of Planning
Department of Planning
CI Government
(345) 244-6506

From: -:*liz*:- <cayman_lizzard@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 29, 2021 11:58 AM
To: haroon.pandohie@gov.ky
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Planning objection

Dear Director of Planning

My name is Elizabeth Lynoe and I am a home owner on 17A84.

I am strongly objecting to the application to build 93 residential units, 44 hotel Suites, 9 story hotel, 5 apartment buildings at 7/9 stories, so townhouses, 2 story garage/ storage, 5 residential lots and amenities on blocks 17A145/146/170REM1.

I am concerned on so many levels-

1. Way to many buildings, just too extreme for the area and neighborhood.
2. Way to high- 7/9 feet???? What an eye sure
3. The roads coming in and out can't handle the traffic especially during raining season.
4. This would be our view- we didn't buy and build here to look at that type of ugliness, it's very upsetting to think something like this would pass through planning.


If they did a cute boutique hotel with a few amenities would be one thing but this is just huge, ugly and not needed. Personally knowing the owners I know they live on the coast in South Sound and have a beautiful view- ask them if they'd like their back yard to look to this wall?

Being Caymanian, asking fellow Caymanians, please don't approve this eyesore, let try and ask for more beauty and taste in the things we are leaving behind.

Regards
Liz

PO Box 32134
Grand Cayman
KY1-1208

949-9212



Appendix C



November 28, 2021
Central Planning Authority
Re: Prisma Development, 17A-170REM1 + 17A-145, 146

The Prisma Project being proposed by Land Ltd. the original developer of Crystal Harbour, is designed to meet the evolving needs of the Crystal Harbour community, the surrounding neighborhoods, and the broader island.

Bringing together a mix of residential offerings, including loft style apartments, townhomes, duplexes, and single-family homes Prisma combines them with a series of intimate commercial, retail, food and beverage offerings woven around an intimate marine basin, all anchored by a Boutique Hotel. Prisma will both create its own community and be a meeting place for the hundreds of families who live within walking distance of the site and currently have little or no public amenities to enjoy

In addition, Crystal Harbour is one of the most active neighborhoods for walking and/or jogging but lacks a safe place for people to gather. The public places in Prisma provide this.

The combination of product offerings also allows for a broad range of purchasers to be part of the community, from singles and young families through to multi-generational households.

Prisma is located on the last large parcel in Crystal Harbour. In order to achieve the correct balance for the Crystal Harbour community, Prisma is designed well below what is allowed under the regulations for this site.

It is, below in height, below in density and exceeds what is required for parking. Despite this it provides what's needed to meet its objective as a focal point for the community, without overwhelming the rest of Crystal Harbour.

The elements that make up Prisma, have also been carefully positioned to interface appropriately with the surroundings, such as the boutique hotel being situated across from the existing Holiday Inn hotel and away from the residential quays and the Duplexes situated across the canal from similar sized homes

Careful consideration has been given to minimizing vehicular traffic with an emphasis on pedestrian flow and public spaces and incorporating electric transport and shared vehicle approaches. The project has also been designed to embrace the surrounding

CAYMAN ISLANDS
18 Forum Lane, Suite 5301, 3rd Floor
Camana Bay, Grand Cayman

USA
210 1/4th Street, Unit 1717
Sunny Isles Beach, FL 33160

trioArchitects.com



waters bringing them into the heart of the development surrounded by the pedestrian promenade, bridge and public gardens

Design specifications also emphasize the need to both construct and operate in the most ecologically sustainable way, focusing on renewable options, minimizing water usage, efficient MEP systems and, as stated above, minimizing vehicular requirements.

1. Project Location:

Crystal Harbour is a residential community in the district of West Bay South, and it contains various types of residential structures, varying from canal front Single-Family Homes, Duplexes, Townhomes, and a Hotel. Below are illustrations of these structures:


Crystal Harbour:



Single Family Homes:



Duplexes:



Townhomes:



Hotel:



2. Site:

- Block & Parcel: 17A-170REM1 + 17A-145 + 17A-146
- Area: 328,508 Sq. Ft. – 7.54 Acres
- Zoning: Hotel Tourism
- Proposed Use: Hotel, Residential, Commercial


3. Project Description:

Prisma consists of (1) 9-story Hotel, (5) Apartment Buildings (between 7 and 9 stories), (10) 3-story Duplexes, (20) 3-story Townhouses, a 2-story garage/storage building, 5 lots designated for single family homes, and a central amenity structure containing a Signature Restaurant, Café, and an Owner's Lounge, all interconnected via lush, landscaped pathways, courtyards, bridge, and public gardens.

The development proposes a total of 93 residential units and 44 hotel rooms, for a total of 137 units.

4. Neighborhood bonding:

The illustration below shows the symbiotic relationship between the various types of proposed structures and the surrounding environment:



Below please find a detailed description of each structure, and their use:

- Hotel:
Prisma Hotel is a 9-Story building, with a Lobby/Restaurant on the ground level, **44** Hotel Suites on 8 floors, and a Roof top Bar and pool,
- Apartment Buildings 1, 3 and 5:
Buildings 1, 3, and 5 are 7 stories, with a 2,019 square feet retail space on the ground level and 10 apartment units each, for a total of **30** units
- Apartment Buildings 2 and 4:
Buildings 2 and 4 are 9 stories, with a 2,019 square feet retail space on the ground level and 14 apartment units each, for a total of **28** units
- Duplexes:
There are 5- 3 story Duplex structures containing a total of **10** units
- Townhouses:
There are 5- 3 story Townhouse structures containing 4 units each, for a total of **20** units
- Lots:
There are 5 serviced lots for future single-family residences
- Amenities:
The Amenities structure consists of a 2-story building containing a Signature Restaurant, a Café, an Owner's Lounge, and community pool. The creation of the Marine Basin and related Promenade, footpaths, bridge, and public gardens will enhance the project as well as the surrounding neighborhood's public spaces.

Other amenities will be delivered via community focused commercial retail offerings in the lower levels of the apartment buildings and through the Boutique Hotel
- Garage/Storage:
The Garage/Storage structure consists of a 2-story building containing 12 covered parking garages on the ground level, and 7,348 square feet of storage space on the second level

5. Compliance with Development and Planning Regulations:

Zoning: Hotel/Tourism

Permitted uses:

Hotels, cottage colony developments and apartments

Proposed uses: **complied**

Residential:

- Hotel, Apartments, Townhouses, Duplexes, Single family homes

Ancillary & Amenities:

- Restaurant, Retail, Garage/Storage

Lot Size:

Required: 0.5 acre = 21,780 sq. ft.

Provided: 7.5 acres = 328,508 sq. ft. **complied**

Site Coverage:

Allowed: 40%

Provided: 24% **complied**

Density:

Hotel:

Allowed: 65 per acre

Provided: 6 per acre **complied**

Apartments:

Allowed: 25 per acre

Provided: 8 per acre **complied**

Townhomes:

Allowed: 25 per acre

Provided: 3 per acre **complied**

Duplex:

Allowed: 3.5 per acre

Provided: 1 per acre **complied**

Single Family Homes:

Allowed: 4.3 per acre

Provided: 1 per acre **complied**

Height:

Allowed: 130' – 10 stories

Provided: 120' – 9 stories **complied**

Parking:

Required: 209


Provided: 223 **complied**

Variances:

The design of the project underwent a careful, multi-year review and development process, and despite the wide range of elements included was able to achieve its intent with only the 2 variances that are being requested.

On behalf of our client, we are requesting the following variances to be granted:

1. The Southeast corner of the Hotel Building is encroaching on to the front setback by 9'-5". It is important to note that the distance between the existing edge of the road and the proposed building is 26'-1". Please see illustration below;



As can be depicted on the sketch above, the following exceptional circumstances apply:

- **8(13)(b)(i)** unusual terrain characteristics limit the site's development potential.
- **8(13)(b)(ii)** the proposal will not be materially detrimental to persons residing or working in the vicinity, to the adjacent property, to the neighborhood, or to the public welfare

2. The Duplexes and Townhomes are being proposed along the edge of the existing seawall, encroaching on to the canal setback. It is important to note the following previously approved projects with similar conditions:
- a. **Ducharme Residence**, located at Diamond's Edge, immediately adjacent to Prisma. The Planning number for reference is P20-0340, which was approved in September, 2020. See below for exact location and details:



b. Ritz Deck Houses



As can be depicted on the descriptions above, the following exceptional circumstances apply:

- **§(13)(b)(i)** the characteristics of the proposed development are consistent with the character of the surrounding area.
- **§(13)(b)(ii)** the proposal will not be materially detrimental to persons residing or working in the vicinity, to the adjacent property, to the neighborhood, or to the public welfare.

The two conditions that trigger the variance request result from the effort to provide the maximum public space within the development.



1994. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

2. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

3. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

4. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

5. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

6. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

7. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

8. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

9. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

10. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

11. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

12. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

13. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

14. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

15. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

16. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

17. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

18. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

19. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

20. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 1000-1001.

Appendix D



PRISMA

HEART OF THE CRYSTAL

Design Brief — Prepared December 2021

INTRODUCTION TO PRISMA





DESIGN VISION

Prisma is a new mixed-use development located in the Heart of Crystal Harbour.

As the community and the island has grown its requirements have evolved and Prisma is designed to not only meet those of today but create the platform for the future, improving and enhancing both the Crystal Harbour Community and that of the wider Cayman Islands.

Prisma is designed to create community by bringing together a wide variety of residential offerings all tied together in a cohesive architectural vocabulary and supported by public amenities that will enhance the lifestyle of the residents and the surrounding Crystal Harbour community.

Although, as stated above, Prisma provides for a wide variety of unit types and services in many smaller buildings, all the elements are tied together with the signature windows and façade elements that create a cohesive architectural statement.

DISCLAIMER: The landscape and images provided in this design brief are for illustrative purposes to assist in understanding the vision and direction of the design of the project, but should not be considered as final representations of project elements to be constructed. For specifics, please refer to plans submitted by the Applicant in the standard application filing under 24 November 2021.

CRYSTAL HARBOUR



DISCLAIMER: The drawings and images provided in this design are for illustrative purposes to assist in understanding the equipment. And details of the design of the project had should not be considered as true representations of actual products or construction. Any specific names, logos or plans submitted by the applicant in the standard application will remain valid until 30 November 2021.

INTRODUCTION TO PRISMA

Since its inception in 1993, Crystal Harbour had a long-term vision to create a community in the heart of the Seven Mile Beach Corridor, bordered by and connecting all elements to the North Sound, a community which would offer a vibrant and varied lifestyle for Cayman. The applicant, Land Limited, is the original developer of Crystal Harbour and the site on which the Prisma project will sit was, from the outset, set aside to be the key parcel to bring to the entire community the type of amenities and services that a mature community would need and want.

This large site, over seven acres, was specifically designated Hotel Tourism to meet these goals, but it needed the community to grow to the point where there was sufficient residential occupation to both need and support the higher levels of service and amenities that this project brings. With over four-hundred homes already existing in the community it has now reached that point.

The overall growth of the Seven Mile Beach Corridor has also necessitated new solutions to create attractive and appealing communities that are not desirable solely for being on the beachfront.

Given its potential and importance to Crystal Harbour and the surrounding communities, the applicant has spent more than five years studying different approaches to create what it feels is the optimal solution for this site.



DISCLAIMER: The drawings and images provided in this design are for illustrative purposes to assist in understanding the proposed use and function of the design of the project and should not be considered as final. The drawings and images are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to be used for any other purpose. The drawings and images are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to be used for any other purpose.



Introduction continued/...

Prisma is designed to be the heart of Crystal Harbour, an urban oasis that brings residents and the surrounding community together with differing residential types, commercial retail spaces, park/garden areas, a bridge and promenades, all surrounding the marine basin. The design engages with, and connects to, the existing canals and the North Sound, and the basin is headed by a spectacular two-story glass signature restaurant/clubhouse area.

In order to achieve its goals, Prisma provides residential options for a wide variety of residents that reflects the changed and changing needs of Cayman. As described more fully below, the project has Lofts for people starting out or downsizing, Townhomes for growing families and Duplexes for larger more established households, all reflecting the surrounding Crystal Harbour community.

All of these residential elements are enhanced and supported under the amenity umbrella of a five-star boutique hotel. A hotel which will bring a new class of accommodation that is greatly needed in Cayman's market.

The commercial/retail areas, located on the ground floors of the Loft towers, are connected to the promenade so that they welcome in the broader community via the many pathways built into the design. They are planned to include such services as a coffee shop, deli/wine bar, gelateria, kinder care, yoga/pilates studio and health center. These are all anchored by the two-story glasshouse featured restaurant at the head of the marine basin, designed to be a magnet for the community and enhance Cayman's growing reputation as the culinary capital of the Caribbean.

The developers have proven experience in designing and executing complex ground-breaking projects that expand what Cayman has to offer and, in doing so, enhance the overall market.




DISCLAIMER: The drawings and images provided in this design book are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to represent the final design or construction of the project. The project is subject to change without notice. The project is not intended to be a representation of actual physical conditions. For specific information, please refer to the plans submitted by the Architect to the relevant authorities through the relevant process.

P R I S M A S I T E P L A N



PRISMA SITE PLAN



DISCLAIMER: The Readings and images provided in this design are for illustrative purposes to show the understanding the requirements and direction of the project and should not be considered as final. The design is subject to change without notice. The design is based on the information provided by the Architect in the attached application filing date 28 November 2023.

COMMUNIAL SPACES

PRISMA COMMUNIAL SPACES

As can be seen in the following pages, the landscape plan for the project has been designed to welcome the community into Prisma via multiple access points onto the public promenade. The promenade winds from the parking area in the south along the edge of the marine basin in front the commercial retail areas, around the Glasshouse and back, through landscaped pathways across the signature bridge so there is a natural flow.

Along the way will be many areas, like the pocket gardens and seating areas where people can pause and gather. Steps down into the water connect to the basin and surrounding canals.

The focal point is the Glasshouse, a two-story restaurant and owners club which will feature gastronomy of the highest level and beverages in an environment that will be unique in Cayman.




DISCLAIMER: The landscape and image provided in this design are for illustrative purposes to assist in understanding the conceptual site development of the project but should not be construed as final representations of what is to be constructed. Prospective owners to plan submitted by the Architect in the record application 1190000 20 November 2022.

PRISMA COMMUNIAL SPACES

LEGEND

- 1 THE PROMENADE
- 2 PUBLIC COURTYARDS
- 3 PUBLIC GARDENS
- 4 THE PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE
- 5 THE GLASSHOUSE GARDEN



PRISMA
PROYECTO DE EDIFICIO RESIDENCIAL

NOTA: Las imágenes y mapas presentados en este nivel de proyecto son meramente orientativos y no deben ser considerados como la base para la ejecución de la obra. El cliente debe ser informado de que el presente proyecto es un estudio preliminar y que los planos y especificaciones técnicas deben ser sometidos a la aprobación de la autoridad competente antes de la construcción. El presente proyecto no debe ser considerado como un documento definitivo.

1 - THE PROMENADE



2 - PUBLIC COURTYARDS



TRIO

ARCHITECTS
1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.TRIOARCHITECTS.COM

VITA

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

PROJECT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

CONCEPT

TRIO

1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202
TEL: 303.733.1111
WWW.VITAARCHITECTS.COM

3 - PUBLIC GARDENS



TRIO

TRIO is a leading provider of landscape architecture and design services. We are committed to creating beautiful, functional outdoor spaces for our clients.

VITA

VITA is a leading provider of landscape architecture and design services. We are committed to creating beautiful, functional outdoor spaces for our clients.

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

1-800-888-8888

5 -THE GLASSHOUSE GARDEN



IRIO

IRIO S.p.A.
Via S. Maria 10
00187 Roma
Tel. 06/4781111
Fax 06/4781112
www.rio.it

VITA

VITA S.p.A.
Via S. Maria 10
00187 Roma
Tel. 06/4781111
Fax 06/4781112
www.vita.it

1993

1994

1995

1996

1997

1998

1999

2000

2001

2002

2003

2004

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

2010

2011

2012

2013

2014

2015

2016

2017

2018

2019

2020

2021

2022

2023

2024

2025

2026

2027

2028

2029

2030

2031

2032

2033

2034

2035

2036

2037

2038

2039

2040

2041

2042

6 - COLORFUL LOCAL PLANTING



TRIO

TRIO INC.

10000 W. 10th Ave.
Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: 303.733.1000
Fax: 303.733.1001
www.trioinc.com

VITA

VITA INC.
10000 W. 10th Ave.
Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: 303.733.1000
Fax: 303.733.1001
www.vita-inc.com

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT MANAGER

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

DESCRIPTION

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

PROJECT

DATE

GLASSHOUSE



DISCLAIMER: The renderings and images provided in this design brief are for illustrative purposes, to assist in understanding the imagination and direction of the design of the project. They are not intended to represent any actual elements to be constructed. For specifics, please refer to plans submitted by the Architect at the installed appropriate date and 28 hours after 2020.

P R I S M A P A R K I N G

PRISMA PARKING

Prisma has addressed the challenges normally associated with parking in a number of ways, beginning by taking advantage of the benefits of a plan that is below the height and density allowed to provide more than is required.

Prisma's site also includes a larger parcel of land on the southeast corner dedicated to parking and storage, opening up more areas for public use on the main portion of the site. This parking feeds directly into the promenade providing easy and safe access for owners and community members alike.

The variety of unit types also allows for decentralized parking with each townhouse and duplex having a minimum of two dedicated spaces directly in front of them.

Parking:

Required: 209


Provided: 223




DISCLAIMER: The PRISMA logo and design presented in this document are the property of the project and are not to be used in any way without the express written permission of the project. The project is not to be used in any way without the express written permission of the project. The project is not to be used in any way without the express written permission of the project.

PARKING

Parking for Residents outlined below



South East Parking
feeding directly onto the Promenade



GETTING AROUND THE COMMUNITY: Prisma's design focuses on supporting alternative transport options



DISCLAIMER: The Renderings and images provided in this design document are for informational purposes only and are not intended to represent the final design or construction of the project. The design and construction of the project are subject to change without notice. The design and construction of the project are subject to the applicable laws and regulations of the jurisdiction. The design and construction of the project are subject to the applicable laws and regulations of the jurisdiction. The design and construction of the project are subject to the applicable laws and regulations of the jurisdiction.




S I T E C O V E R A G E & C O M M U N I T Y I N T E R F A C E

SITE COVERAGE & COMMUNITY INTERFACE

The 7.54 acre Prisma's site is one of the last large sites in the Seven Mile Beach Corridor and with its unique triangular shape it is surrounded by water with views in all directions.

The full allowance for the hotel tourism zoning on this site is represented in the attached massing studies and the proposed Prisma elements within.


Although, as can be seen in the attached massing studies, the hotel tourism designation allows for significantly more density and additional height, after careful study the elements of the Prisma design were developed to deliver the optimal solution for the project and the Crystal Harbour community while staying below what is currently permitted on the site.



DISCLAIMER: The renderings and images provided in this design brief are for illustrative purposes only and do not represent the final design or construction of the project. The design and construction of the project may vary from the renderings and images provided in this design brief. The design and construction of the project may vary from the renderings and images provided in this design brief. The design and construction of the project may vary from the renderings and images provided in this design brief.

SITE COVERAGE & COMMUNITY INTERFACE / Cont

The Prisma design brings the surrounding water into the center of the site and maximizes the public space surrounding the Marine Basin.



DISCLAIMER: The drawings and images provided in this design that are for reference purposes, for visualisation and not for final design. The drawings and images are for reference purposes only and should not be considered as final. The drawings and images are for reference purposes only and should not be considered as final.


SITE COVERAGE & COMMUNITY INTERFACE / Cont

In order to match the vision and character of the surrounding community and create distinction between the elements Prisma is designed in a series of small structures containing between two and fourteen units per building. The different building types have been positioned to relate to the surrounding elements, for example the boutique hotel is positioned across from the existing Holiday Inn hotel, the Loft buildings across from the proposed lower and multi-story units of Waterfronts Development Ltd.'s project, and the duplexes across the north canal relating to similar sized residential homes (below are examples of existing properties).

Single Family Homes:



Duplexes:



Crystal Harbour:



Townhomes:




Hotel:



DISCLAIMER: The Renderings and images provided in this concept book are for illustrative purposes, to assist in understanding the impression and character of the images of the project but should not be considered as final representations of what is to be constructed. For specific plans refer to plans submitted by the Architect or the architect's representative. © 2014 Prisma Development Ltd.

SITE COVERAGE & COMMUNITY INTERFACE / Cont



PRISMA PROPERTY OPTIONS



Prisma Design Brief

28



PRISMA
HEART OF THE CRYSTAL

LOFTS

Representing the inspiration and structure of the design of the project has played a role in the creation of the final design.
© 2023 by the author. All rights reserved.


PRISMA LOFTS

The Lofts are contained in five buildings ranging from 10 to 14 units per building. They are carefully situated to maximize views east and west.

With only two units per floor, using the signature glazing approach, they have extensive natural light with windows on three sides and balconies on both the east and west sides.



GENERAL NOTE: All drawings and designs presented are for conceptual purposes only and are not intended to be used for construction. The information and data presented are for informational purposes only and should not be considered as final. For approval, please refer to the project's specific requirements and specifications. The information and data presented are for informational purposes only and should not be considered as final. For approval, please refer to the project's specific requirements and specifications. The information and data presented are for informational purposes only and should not be considered as final. For approval, please refer to the project's specific requirements and specifications.





PRISMA
HEART OF THE CRYSTAL


TOWNHOMES

DISCLAIMER: The drawings and images provided in this image book are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to represent the actual design of the project. The design is subject to change without notice. The actual design of the project is subject to the final approved plans and specifications. The actual design of the project is subject to the final approved plans and specifications.

PRISMA TOWNHOMES

The townhomes, in five blocks of four units each, connect both to the canal and the marine basin.

Spaced over three floors with the same focus on natural light they provide the next evolution of townhome living.



DISCLAIMER: The drawings and images provided are for illustrative purposes only and do not constitute an offer or a contract. The architect and the client shall be responsible for the final design and construction. The drawings are subject to change without notice. The drawings are not to be used for any other purpose without the written consent of the architect.




PRISMA
HEART OF THE CRYSTAL

DUPLEXES

PRISMA DUPLEXES

Oriented towards the north canal the Duplexes speak to the larger homes in that area and provide a unique under-houseboat garage that brings these units into direct connection with the surrounding canals.

With over five thousand feet of living space and private elevators the Duplexes have a unique appeal.



DISCLAIMER: The renderings and images provided in this brochure are for illustrative purposes only. It is understood that the appearance and direction of the design of the project may be subject to change without notice. The design and construction of the project shall be governed by the applicable laws and regulations. The information provided in this brochure is not intended to constitute an offer of any financial product or service. For more information, please contact the Architect or the project manager. The information provided in this brochure is not intended to constitute an offer of any financial product or service. For more information, please contact the Architect or the project manager. The information provided in this brochure is not intended to constitute an offer of any financial product or service. For more information, please contact the Architect or the project manager.

PRISMA BOUTIQUE HOTEL



PRISMA BOUTIQUE HOTEL

As an international travel and business destination Cayman needs to update its offering in the hospitality market to meet and exceed what is available in its competitor markets.

In recent years, the luxury sector has increasingly moved towards boutique hotels, smaller, more intimate properties, properties with unique character reflective of the locales they are based in.

Covid has accelerated this shift with clients actively seeking smaller properties with less contact and less density.

Prisma's boutique hotel offers an intimate forty-four rooms on top of a stylish reception area and capped by an open-air rooftop pool with a cantilevered glass pool, dining area and spa facilities.

The hotel will attract a new segment of international travelers as well as provide options for medium to longer term stay for people associated with Prisma owners and those in the Crystal Harbour Community.

The hotel will also underpin the amenity offerings spread across the public spaces providing a centralized management and control over the other offerings insuring consistent high-quality delivery.


The success of the hotel should support future hospitality offerings, not necessarily on waterfront locations.

The developers have proven and numerous years of experience delivering the finest hospitality properties in Cayman.



DISCLAIMER: The drawings and images provided in this design are for illustrative purposes to assist in understanding the objectives and direction of the design of the project, but should not be considered as final and preliminary actual drawings to be constructed. For project a more detailed and submitted by the Architect in the separate application filing case 20-H-00000-2023.


PRISMA BOUTIQUE HOTEL FLOOR PLANS



Lobby-Ground Floor



Hotel Suites & Rooms



Roof Top Pool & Terrace



DISCLAIMER: The renderings and images provided in this design brief are for illustrative purposes, to assist in understanding the importance and direction of the design of the project but should not be considered as final, represented or guaranteed. They are not to be used for any other purpose without the written consent of the architect. (Paragraph 2.2.1)

BOUTIQUE HOTEL INSPIRATION



DISCLAIMER: The Renderings and images provided in this design report are for illustrative purposes, to assist in understanding the requirements and direction of the design of the project but should not be considered as final representation of actual elements to be constructed. For specific details refer to drawings provided by the Architect. All the content is for your guidance and is not intended to be used as a final design.

P R I S M A S U M M A R Y



PRISMA SUMMARY

Prisma is a key step in the evolution of Crystal Harbour and the Seven Mile Beach Corridor. Providing new and varied accommodations to meet emerging needs and blending them into a community with a new level of service and amenities.

Prisma will deliver this on an existing parcel, connecting to existing canals and without the need to impact any pristine or untouched areas. Prisma's design achieves its goals while staying below what is currently permitted on the site.

The layout of Prisma's elements are positioned to correspond with the areas of similar use on the surrounding sites.

Prisma is focused on engaging the surrounding community, providing the maximum public space and the widest array of services and amenities.

Prisma is designed to minimize environmental and vehicular traffic, promoting sustainable approaches along with new modes of transport.

ZONING: Hotel/Tourism

Permitted uses:

Hotels, cottage colony developments and apartments

Proposed uses: Compliant

Residential:

Hotel, Apartments, Townhouses, Duplexes, Single family homes

Ancillary & Amenities:

Restaurant, Retail, Garage/Storage

Lot Size:

Required: 0.5 acre = 21,760 sq. ft.

Provided: 7.5 acres = 328,508 sq. ft. Compliant

Site Coverage:

Allowed: 40%

Provided: 24% Compliant

DENSITY:

Hotel:

Allowed: 65 per acre

Provided: 6 per acre Compliant

Apartments:

Allowed: 25 per acre

Provided: 8 per acre Compliant

Townhomes:

Allowed: 25 per acre

Provided: 3 per acre Compliant

Duplex:

Allowed: 3.5 per acre

Provided: 1 per acre Compliant

Single Family Homes:

Allowed: 4.3 per acre

Provided: 1 per acre Compliant

Height:

Allowed: 130' = 10 stories

Provided: 120' = 9 stories Compliant

Parking:

Required: 209

Provided: 223 Compliant



DISCLAIMER: The drawings and images provided in this design are for illustrative purposes only, and are not intended to represent the final design or construction of the project. The design and construction of the project shall be governed by the applicable laws and regulations of the jurisdiction in which the project is located. The design and construction of the project shall be subject to the approval of the relevant authorities. The design and construction of the project shall be subject to the approval of the relevant authorities. The design and construction of the project shall be subject to the approval of the relevant authorities.

Appendix E

17 January 2022

Land Limited
PO Box 1106
Grand Cayman KY1-1106
Cayman Islands

Dear Sir:

RE: USE OF BLOCK 17 A - PARCEL 373

Land Limited, owner of Block 17A - Parcel 373 do hereby grant to Land Limited owner of Block 17A - Parcels 17OREM1, 145 and 146 the right to use the section of Block 17A - Parcel 373, as further described and outlined in yellow in the attached survey, for the construction of such sidewalks, curbs, parking spaces and structures as are necessary for its planned development know as Prisma on these parcels.

Yours sincerely

For and on behalf of Land Limited




Dale Crighton
Director

**SITE PLAN OF
BLOCK 17A, PARCEL 373
GRAND CAYMAN
BRITISH WEST INDIES**

ROLAND BODDEN & CO. LTD.

SCALE: 1 : 2,000

AREAS AND DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE



ROLAND BODDEN & CO. LTD.
LICENSED LAND & ENGINEERING SURVEYORS
P.O. BOX 2513, GRAND CAYMAN
KY1-1108, CAYMAN ISLANDS
TEL: 049-6177
EMAIL: rjb3@candw.ky

DRAWN BY: DANIEL STERLING
DATE DRAWN: SEPT. 27, 2021

THIS PLAN WAS PREPARED EXCLUSIVELY
FOR LAND LTD. AND NO
PERSON MAY COPY, REPRODUCE OR ALTER THIS
PLAN WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF
ROLAND BODDEN & CO. LTD.

DRAWING #: 17A327RC.dwg

JOB #: 21-083

BOUNDARIES SHOWN ON THIS
PLAN ARE NOT FINAL UNTIL
FIXED IN ACCORDANCE WITH
SECTION 18 OF THE
REGISTERED LAND LAW.