## **Meredith Rollins**

From:	Nancy van Loggerenberg <nancyvanberg@gmail.com></nancyvanberg@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, March 21, 2024 7:02 AM
То:	Zoning Inquiries
Subject:	<sup>™</sup> URGENT CITIZEN AGAINST Proposal for VARIANCE on Nancy Canal

## This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Nancy van Loggerenberg 936 SE 10th Ct Pompano Beach, FL 33060 Zoning@copbfl.com 754-207-1580

March 20, 2024

City of Pompano Beach Zoning Department RE: P&Z #: 23-11000016

Dear Sirs/Madam:

I am writing as a concerned resident along the Nancy Canal, having received notice of the requested variance from Pompano Real Estate Investments for finger docks at the 855 S Federal Hwy location. I plan to attend the meeting on March 21st, along with several neighbors, to voice our collective concerns. Should I not be able to attend, submit this letter to the council as my formal vote of NO.

In reviewing the application and the reasons for plan rejection by Mr. McGirr of the Engineering Department, several points have arisen:

1. **\*\*Inadequate Reference to Mean Low and Mean High Water**\*\*: Dock Experts' failure to address the MLR as defined by engineering, and instead referencing MLW and MHW, is concerning. Clarity on these definitions is essential for ensuring compliance with zoning regulations and protecting our waterways.

2. **\*\*Ambiguity Regarding Property Boundaries\*\*:** Contradictory statements by Dock Experts regarding the project's alignment with property lines raise concerns about potential encroachment and disputes with neighboring properties. Ambiguities like these undermine community cohesion.

3. **\*\*Historical Disputes and Legal Challenges\***\*: The contested ownership of the eastern bank, evidenced by past legal proceedings, highlights the complex history of land tenure along the Nancy Canal. Any development in this area must consider historical disputes and legal precedent.

4. **\*\*Questionable Justifications for the Variance\*\***: The rationale provided by the applicant for the waiver request lacks substance and raises doubts about the true intentions behind the proposed project. Concerns regarding navigation, environmental impact, and adherence to zoning classifications remain unresolved.

Additionally, the transition of a car dealership property into a marina-like business model raises significant concerns about land use compatibility and long-term neighborhood implications.

In conclusion, the license granted by Broward County references use and fees for a boatyard/marina, which isn't disclosed in the variance petition. Compliance with local requirements is paramount, and further studies, particularly on wildlife, flora, and fauna, and navigability, are necessary. I urge the city to carefully consider its decision regarding the variance for a car dealership seemingly venturing into the marina business.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Regards,

Nancy van Loggerenberg