

Planning Commission – May 1, 2025

1. Prime real estate that we really need to program. Important to find the balance which creates a great outdoor space and the commercial uses.
2. Historically a fishing Wharf. There is concern about the removal of fishing in Options 1 and 2. Fishing should remain. Keep the hoist for fishing and safety in the final option.
3. If the City Council were to go with mobile vendors, one of the mobile vendors could be a fishing concession that also manages the hoist and sells bait.
4. The City's Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan identifies the Wharf as a public fishing Wharf. Removing the fishing concession and hoist would conflict with the LCP LUP and require an update certified by the Coastal Commission.
5. Support the additional bathroom at the end of the Wharf in all options.
6. The City should further study the economic viability of the options with new commercial uses. Need to take into consideration the cost of the construction, the economic viability of the commercial use, and the seasonality of doing business on the wharf. The economic analysis should help drive the choice made by the City Council. We should look at the data from the previous restaurant and fishing concession, to assist with the analysis.
7. The seasonal nature of the Wharf will be a challenge for business owners. During the winter months, it will be very challenging for the business owner(s) on the wharf.
8. With mobile vendors, the City could just have them there April through October, and close for the winter.
9. The marketplace within Option 6, would provide a warm space during the off-season.
10. Future uses on the Wharf should be an attraction with something special that brings more people to the Village and have a positive economic impact. The attraction could differentiate the Capitola Wharf from other wharfs in the area.
11. Mobile vendors are intriguing. The City should consider starting small (1 or 2) and adding more if successful. Four vendors, as shown, may not be necessary.
12. Lot of great options, but ultimately a hybrid option should be considered. Many good ideas may be best combined.
13. Options 1 and 2 should have more space for vendors to access the Wharf and remain flexible.
14. For the more expensive option, there was concern with the recent storms and the need for the city to consider the impacts of climate change and the fiscal burden on future taxpayers. Ongoing maintenance and replacement costs are expensive and should also be considered. Option 2 is a sustainable option with less risk as it has the ability to move the vendors off the wharf if a storm is expected.
15. Further analysis should be conducted on the proposed land uses and the functional impacts on the Wharf in relation to vehicles, deliveries, and trash.
16. Concern with the height and massing of Options 6 and 7 due to their impact on views.
17. Public comment was received supporting a taller building at the end of the Wharf and advocating for local labor in construction.

Museum Committee – May 1, 2025

1. Support for lifeguard station. Add a lifeguard station to Options 1 and 2.
2. Consider installing plexiglass at the end of the Wharf to reduce wind.
3. Concern about the location of the stage at the end of the Wharf next to fishing. Consider the impacts of fishing and bait on the stage. May want to relocate the stage and leave the end of the Wharf for fishing.
4. Consider wind exposure in the placement of the stage.
5. Music and entertainment would be great to have back on the Wharf. Music on the Wharf can be enjoyed by all nearby residents.
6. Appreciate that the stage is open for public enjoyment and not restricted to a restaurant.
7. Offer leases to Village vendors for mobile vending.
8. The City should consider a setup similar to the Ferry Building with a farmers market.
9. The Wharf is a great location to share Capitola's history through wall space on conditioned walls. Future buildings should include exhibit space for museum photographs and stories.
10. The exteriors of the buildings could display historic quotes.
11. The Wharf is a special part of Capitola's Begonia Festival and now Beach Festival, including the fishing contest.
12. Fishing is a big part of the Wharf's history.
13. The Wharf is the only fishing spot in Capitola where no permit is required.
14. The options with enclosed storage for boats are an improvement over what exists today.
15. The full restaurant concept is classy but high-risk. With increasingly destructive storms and a \$6.2 million price tag, this is a gamble. Mobile vendors are a smarter and less risky alternative.

Art and Culture Committee – May 13, 2025

1. Appreciates the open space.
 2. Not in favor of too many benches. Need to maintain access to the stage and mobile vendors.
 3. Likes open space.
 4. A lifeguard station is a good idea.
 5. Don't allow concessions to get too big.
 6. Keep the hoist and fishing operations. Fishing should remain on the Wharf.
 7. Would like a restaurant as an attraction on the Wharf and in Capitola Village. Concern that vendors could detract from Village businesses.
 8. The new bathroom at the end of the Wharf should be more typical and less high-tech than those near the entrance.
 9. Support a stage on the restaurant as it aids in licensing.
 10. Mobile food vendors could be limited by weather. There is support for a marketplace option.
 11. Maximize open space. The Wharf felt very crowded during last year's events. Need room for people.
 12. The restaurant idea is not inclusive—it is limited to paying patrons.
 13. Suggestion for Option 3 with a new restaurant and stage. This would preserve fishing in its current form.
 14. Suggestion for a hybrid approach with open space and either a mobile vendor or restaurant.
 15. A two-level experience is appealing.
 16. Decrease the size of fishing concessions.
 17. Support for yoga.
 18. The former restaurant was often crowded and lacked enough seating.
 19. Support for the bathroom.
 20. Opportunity for public art. Ideas include climbable art for kids (similar to the seals in Esplanade Park), a kiosk, art that complements the view, room for future art, and pedestals for sculptures.
-

New Brighton Middle School – Student Council

1. Lifeguard storage should be included in all options.
2. Stage is good, but concerns about its size—it may need to be bigger.
3. Make sure there are electrical outlets for future uses.
4. Don't place too many seats in front of stage. People will bring their own chairs to events.
5. Option 5 should include tables between the food vendors.
6. The market space in Option 6 takes up too much space. Vendors offer more flexibility. Consider adding mobile vendors to Option 6.
7. The Village already has food.
8. Like how peaceful the Wharf is. The Village is busy and active. The Wharf offers a quiet retreat. Options 6 and 7 could be too busy and crowded.
9. Support for Options 3, 5, 6, and 7. The group leaned toward Option 5 for its inclusion of fishing concession, mobile vendors, lifeguard storage, bathroom, open space, and quiet atmosphere.

CVWBIA: Capitola Village and Wharf Business Improvement Area

Capitola City Council & Staff,

Thank you for requesting BIA input. We urged our membership to complete the Wharf Survey, which many have done.

The Board of Directors has discussed the Wharf Plan at several board meetings. We offer the following representation of support and partnership.

Preserving the wharf's legacy as a FISHING pier is essential. The options presented all have merits. The BIA appreciates the opportunity to be involved now and on an ongoing basis in the development of the chosen solution to optimize economic development and limit disruption to the Village and Wharf area business community.

Thank you,
Anthony Guajardo
Chair, Capitola Village and Wharf Business Improvement Area

Coastal Commission

1. Like the additional seating, tables, and planters, which increase public access.
2. Like the open space along the Wharf edge for fishing and enjoying the view.
3. In options that remove the hoist, the City should consider the impacts, as this hoist uniquely provides small boat access to the water.
4. Like the stage but are concerned about its location at the end of the Wharf and possible conflicts with fishing.
5. Support integrated art in the project.
6. Mobile vendors should be moved away from the edge to preserve fishing access and views.
7. Consider adding a stage, benches, picnic tables, and planters to Option 3.
8. Support for lifeguard station. The need for a Marine Rescue Water Craft has been raised in the past.
9. Concern about the size of fishing concessions that store boats—they take up too much space and block views.
10. In options with larger structures, ensure final design considers scale and views, using varied materials and breaking up massing.
11. Option 6 includes many LUP-supported elements: fishing, lifeguard, bathrooms, and a local market. It resembles the Embarcadero, with a marketplace and eclectic uses, and allows public access to enclosed seating without requiring restaurant patronage.
12. Option 7 may oversaturate the Wharf with a single restaurant that only patrons can access.
13. A stage on the Wharf provides access for all to public events.
14. Overall support for thoughtful designs among the seven options.

Commission on the Environment

1. It is important for City Council to consider the very likely risk of additional Wharf damage from extreme storms alongside public preferences.
2. Analyze the likelihood of coastal impacts using data from the Wharf project's engineers or architects.
3. New Wharf structures would be vulnerable to future extreme storm events.
4. It does not make sense to remove the boat hoist. It serves an important purpose, and removal would generate unnecessary construction waste. It also prevents the community from engaging with the Sanctuary and environment.
5. The City should explore other locations for boat storage and repair. It should determine whether boat repair over the Sanctuary is still a permitted activity.
6. The City should ask Fuse how to make Wharf energy use more sustainable (e.g., solar panels) and assess the related costs.
7. City Council should weigh sustainability and resiliency data alongside public opinion.
8. No strong preference for specific options; open to considering a hybrid approach.
9. City Council should review Wharf vulnerability data and projected storm frequency and intensity to assess risk and costs.
10. City Council should consider new waste streams from vendors, restaurants, or markets and the City's capacity to manage this waste.
11. How will the City insure new structures?
12. Mobile vendors could be removed seasonally when coastal hazard risks increase.
13. The public survey lacked information on Wharf resiliency and how options may be affected physically and financially by extreme storms. With better information, public responses might have differed.
14. It's important for City Council to balance public feedback with the Wharf's climate vulnerability.
15. The Wharf is a vital way for people to connect with the ocean. For many, walking out onto the pier is their only opportunity.
16. The Wharf is mostly used during spring and summer; this should factor into the evaluation of options.
17. Permanent structures should not be placed on the Wharf. Open space and movable structures (e.g., portable stage) allow flexibility. We could design the Wharf for the next 2–3 years rather than for 20 years.
18. The current bait shop location makes sense because it's close to the boat launch.
19. Motion to recommend that City Council consider the Wharf's longevity, structural capacity, vulnerability to future climate events, waste impacts, and new structural burdens. The motion was amended to include a recommendation that City Council review vulnerability and storm modeling data in combination with public survey results.

Capitola Wharf Enhancement Project Recommendations

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to give our input on the new wharf options. After having gathered 1,041 surveys and having talked to hundreds of people and many donors we feel confident that the following are what most of our community would like to see.

1. Fishing is an historical use of this wharf. Please support fishing in all its aspects; keep the boats on the wharf, allow a larger, permanent bait shop, reinstate the fish tank, and if the fish cleaning station is not finished it is important to finish that.
2. Keep the whole wharf open 24 hours a day, as it was before.
3. Keep as much open space on the wharf as possible. People said they appreciate the open space. Maintain flexibility and see how people use the new wharf. Place nothing down the middle. Do not install a stage at wharf level. No planter boxes, they are not needed and will cause the city hours of maintenance. Consider installing fewer benches, there are already 40 benches on the wharf.
4. Install a second bathroom at the end of the wharf. It could be low tec. It really helps the fishermen.
5. We agree that a restaurant with an upstairs music/dancing patio is something most people want to see. CWEP prefers the city not have a large investment in this feature.
6. Require the bait shop to offer seasonal moorings.
7. We encourage the city to install as many of the donated bronze fish as possible now and install the rest when the final wharf plan is solidified. We encourage all educational aspects and hope NOAA's interpretive kiosks will still be installed.
8. Please find a way to level the wharf planks, they are impossible to walk on. The wharf at Pismo Beach is level so it must be possible.