

**From:** [Robert Ventresca](#)  
**To:** [Zoning Inquiries](#)  
**Subject:** Variance P&Z number 24-11000013 Opposition 505 N. Ocean Blvd Pompano Beach  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 17, 2024 10:45:39 AM

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

I own 525 N. Ocean Blvd Unit 519. I am writing to oppose the variances for P&Z number 24-11000013 505 N Ocean Blvd.

After reviewing the plans for the redevelopment of the 505 N Ocean Blvd property, I fail to see the new owner's justification for "hardship" and the need for the applied variances. The owners understood that when they bought this property. It was a small property that came with specific codes. Just because the architecture plans would like the land to accommodate the plan doesn't warrant the Zoning Board to grant the appeal to change the code.

To narrow the driveway requirements from 24 feet to 17.83 feet presents many challenges. The driveway is about 50 feet from a very busy intersection. Making a driveway more narrow doesn't allow enough margin for error for the drivers and safety should be of paramount concern. This can cause safety issues as cars are pulling in and out and as they encroach onto the sidewalk on the eastern part of their property line. Pedestrians, bicyclists, children on scooters, and disabled neighbors may not have enough time to react to cars and vice versa. In addition, the crosswalk is about 50 feet from the south eastern property line. This is the main intersection where people on foot, strollers, and assisted walking devices cross to the beach and access to the pier. Having a new set of 6 cars coming out daily of a narrow driveway, only 50 feet away, makes the intersection more frequently dangerous for the neighborhood. There are often already people failing to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk. How much quicker is one supposed to walk or move if more cars are coming quickly out of a narrow and short drive way about 50 feet away with more car traffic...

The other variances also requested are regarding the front and rear setbacks and stepbacks. I don't see how these could be granted to such a small parcel. The code is very clear for good reason. The applicant shares in their narrative that, the "property is insufficiently wide and insufficiently large." That doesn't prove a hardship. These variances are being requested because the owner wants to build up and change the code to help increase their investment which is not the city's responsibility. At the maximum the allowable height should be equal to but not higher than the property immediately to the west of the said property.

I hope my letter of opposition is fairly weighted to deny the appeal. Thank you.

Dr. Robert Ventresca

Sent from my iPad