

**From:** [Mark Rolland](#)  
**To:** [Scott Reale](#); [Zoning Inquiries](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Opposition to Variance Application - P&Z number 24-11000013  
**Date:** Sunday, February 16, 2025 3:51:07 PM  
**Attachments:** [Pompano Zoning.docx](#)

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Please find attached a copy of my opposition document.

On Sun, Feb 16, 2025 at 1:59 PM Mark Rolland <[markjrolland@gmail.com](mailto:markjrolland@gmail.com)> wrote:

Scott Reale, AICP

Principal Planner  
City of Pompano Beach, Planning and Zoning  
100 West Atlantic Boulevard  
Pompano Beach, Florida 33060

Re: Variance P&Z number 24-11000013 for property located at 505 North Ocean Blvd in Pompano Beach, Florida.  
Letter of Opposition

Dear Mr. Reale,

I respectfully submit this document to express my opposition to Variance P&Z number 24-11000013 for property located at 505 North Ocean Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida. In his application, the Developer proposes to demolish the recently remodeled single-family residence currently located at that address. If the four (4) variances were to be approved, the Developer intends to build a 4-story, 50'6" tall (64' to the top of elevator shaft) multi-family building with 3 individually owned condominium units on this 0.16-acre parcel of land. Additionally, there would be a shared open roof deck. I express my opposition to this proposal for several reasons including concerns of safety along with quality-of-life issues.

In his application, the Developer states that by not receiving approval of the variances, the refusal would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the land or structure and result in an unnecessary and undue hardship. I find this statement to be nonsensical as the property can freely be used in its current state - as a single-family home. The Developer continues by adding the variance would not adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood, be injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood, or otherwise be detrimental to the public welfare. Again, nonsensical for several reasons. If these variances were to be approved, the developed property would adversely affect property values of neighboring homes due to the loss of scenic views. Any addition of an open-air roof top deck would surely prove to be a detriment to the peaceful existence of the neighborhood, especially considering it is proposed to be a shared location for three (3) residences. A beachfront entertainment area is likely to be utilized by the friends & family of owners/renters. Repeated late night entertainment gatherings with alcohol fueled voices and loud

music will significantly lessen the quality of life for those neighbors in close proximity to this property.

Another concern centers on safety. The application does not address additional parking needs. Where are delivery drivers, repairmen, family and friends supposed to park? There is no parking on North Ocean Blvd or on associated side streets. The immediate area of this driveway sees a great deal of foot and vehicular traffic. Just south of this driveway is a heavily used pedestrian crosswalk. Additionally, a foot bridge used to access the public beach is in close proximity to this crosswalk. Vehicular traffic currently has major safety concerns as the 505 driveway opens out onto North Ocean Boulevard at the termination of an 'S' curve. Northbound vehicles are already distracted by the reduction in travel lanes, the merging of traffic from North Pompano Beach Boulevard and the crossing of pedestrians at this crosswalk. The addition of extra vehicles entering and/or exiting this driveway, along with delivery, repair or family vehicles parked in this vicinity is a safety hazard.

The Developer in his application states "The property is insufficiently wide (50' whereas the Code requires 75') for a multifamily lot." The applicant knew full well the size of the land parcel (0.16acre) and of the restrictions prior to his purchasing the property. The hardship he repeatedly cites is self-imposed and therefore not a reason to approve the assorted variances. I would argue the proposed changes would alter the established aesthetics and zoning intent of the neighborhood and would significantly decrease the values of nearby properties. Finally, I would suggest that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that he faces an undue and extraordinary hardship that justifies the approval of these variances. It is for these reasons that the developer's application should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mark Rolland  
525 N.Ocean Blvd #915  
Pompano Beach, Florida  
33062