

From: Linda Connors <lconnors@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 9:56 PM
To: 'Lamarca, Chip'; Beverly Perkins; Lamar Fisher; Charlotte Burrie; Rex Hardin; ed.phillips@copbfl.com; Michael Sobel; mbogen@broward.org; Nrich@broward.org; mudine@broward.org; Sgeller@broward.org; Bfurr@broward.org; Tryan@broward.org; dholness@broward.org
Cc: 'Debbie Lipscomb'; Maggie Barszewski; marti25999@hotmail.com; 'Cyndi Blackwood'; lconnors95@comcast.net
Subject: RE: Hidden Harbour Marina - Item #44 on May 22nd Commission Agenda

Good afternoon,

My name is Linda Connors. I am writing on behalf of my aunt, Joan Connors, a Pompano Beach resident who owns 2941 NE 18th Street. She is opposed to the proposed land use amendment for the Hidden Harbor Marina property. While her property is not within the 500' noticed area, she is in the neighborhood adjacent to this development and is opposed to the proposed request to amend the land use at the Hidden Harbour Marina to High Mixed Use. This project is #44 on the May 22nd Commission meeting agenda.

The following are our points of opposition to the proposed change in use to MUR (mixed use residential) with a HIGH residential density designation.

1. Pompano Beach adopted a Transformation Corridor Study in 2013. This study identified transportation corridors and established desired community outcomes and ways in which to achieve these outcomes. This study is included in your agenda item backup and on page 76 of this agenda item's back up, THE HUB is discussed. This area includes the proposed Hidden Harbour Marina land. The HUB desired outcomes are 2 and 3 story mixed use residential buildings for a total of 655 new housing units and 449,000 new retail space. This plan is to scale with the neighborhood and would be a welcome addition to the area. The proposed plan – adding 343 units on just over 3.5 acres (the other land in the project is either waterway, streets, or is designated for marina uses without a residential component) will result in development that is inconsistent with the city's Transformation Corridor Study.
2. Mixed use allows higher densities and intensities based on the assumption that there will be a higher interaction between the uses. For example, residents of the site will work at the commercial area and visit the restaurants and service areas on site. This interaction will decrease the overall traffic in the area. However, the proposed commercial on this site (65,000 square feet) will limit the interaction – especially when the large amount of this commercial is dedicated to the existing boat storage facility on the site. Subtracting the existing boat storage facility from the total square footage of proposed commercial will leave very little commercial use to accommodate a live/work assumption and justify the higher density proposed for the residential component.
3. The applicant is requesting a change in density from Low-Medium and Medium-High to High which allows 50 units an acre. The Planning and Zoning report states that the applicant has voluntarily reduced the unit count to 38.5 units an acre for a total of 343 units on the site where 85 units are currently allowed. This density is very deceiving for a number of reasons.
 - a. This density is measured on the gross acreage. In this case, the gross acreage includes a portion of the waterway which inflates the actual land.
 - b. While the site is almost 9 acres (including the waterway), the actual area that will include the residential units is proposed on only approximately 3.65 acres. The remaining acreage is either required to have marina use or is the waterway. This is a proposed density of about 94 units an acre. The proposed density and intensity of the site is inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

4. The immediate adjacent neighborhood to the south includes medium density townhome buildings and low density single family residences. And while the applicant has agreed to cap the height of the residential buildings to 3 stories within 50 feet of a residential unit, this proposal would further increase the density along Federal Highway and would require a building design that is inconsistent with the neighborhood.
5. The traffic analysis is deceiving. The traffic analysis is based on the maximum possible development permitted for the existing use based on the future land use map and then comparing it with their project so they can claim a decrease in traffic. In fact, they are assuming 60% coverage for the existing commercial acreage with a height of 10 stories. That would never happen here as stated because they would need parking and there is a height cap due to the airport. The analysis should address the marina parcel separately, since they are required to maintain the use and they should provide a new study that includes what could realistically be built on the site with the existing land use and compare that study to what is being proposed.
6. Existing incompatible use. The marina is an existing incompatible use. The testimony of the public that is included in the back up supports this. However, the proposed plan is to keep the marina use and add an additional 250+ housing units in the area. There is no logic in this decision.
7. Proximity to the airport. There is no discussion regarding the proximity of the proposed development to the Pompano Beach AirPark. The intensity of the use along Federal Highway will mandate a higher building. This is not in the best interest for the airport. In addition, adding 243 units this close to the airport is also not a good idea. Airports generally require low density in the areas surrounding because of the inherent conflict due to the noise of the airplanes. Adding additional residential units this close to the airport is contrary to the airport use.
8. The proposed change does not follow the City's vision. In 2009, the City approved a land use change to Planned Commercial with underlying M-1 Marine Business and B-3 General Business (despite the MH land use designation over much of the land), more consistent with the marina use and Federal Highway. This is more consistent with the Federal Highway corridor and was the City's vision just 6 years ago. Now, the applicant is chasing the market and is asking the City to change their vision to accommodate their desire to add residential units (high return on investment). What has changed in the past six years that would support this dramatic change?
9. The proposal will significantly impact the area, however only a 500' notice was sent to the surrounding property owners. Please look closely to the notice map that is included in the Town's back up to the agenda item so that you can see the limited number of people that were actually sent a notice regarding the proposed change. While the legal requirement was met, the notice fails to include the people that will have to live with the impact of no less than 700 additional residents (@ 2 persons a unit) in this area. I spoke with the City's planner, Maggie Barszewski, and asked that I be included in the notice in June. She expected that the item would be scheduled on an agenda in September. Just three days ago, she emailed me to tell me the item was scheduled for the July 26th meeting. This came as a complete surprise and did not give me a sufficient amount of time to inform the residents in the area about the project. In fact, many of the residents that I spoke with were on vacation and not available.

In closing, I would like to add that a proposed plan that is compatible with the neighborhood would be welcomed. This is not that plan. Adding an additional 243 units and ignoring the vision that the city approved just a short six years ago is wrong. We urge you to vote no to this proposed amendment. And furthermore, work with the community at large to plan for a more appropriate development.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please contact me should you have additional questions. Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the meeting on Tuesday, but I am requesting that this email be included in the public record.

Linda Connors

On behalf of Joan Connors, Pompano Beach property owner

