

Jae Eun Kim

From: Barretta-Perez, Joanne <joanne.m.barretta-perez@verizon.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2019 9:40 AM
To: Rhonda Eaton; Andrea McGee; Tom McMahon; Beverly Perkins; Barry Moss; Jae Eun Kim; Asceleta Hammond
Subject: 1508 N. OCEAN BLVD.

EXTERNAL Email: Do not reply, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's **EMAIL ADDRESS** as legitimate and know the contents are safe.

Please keep the above property zoned at RM-45. Please do not allow Pompano Beach to become the new Sunny Isles, Hollywood, Hallendale, North Miami Beach. Please keep the height restrictions in place.

Thank you,

Joanne Barretta-Perez
Pompano Resident



Alone we can do so little; together we can do so much. "Helen Keller"

Jae Eun Kim

From: Joseph Gassib <joeegassibrealty@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2019 5:01 PM
To: Jae Eun Kim
Subject: Change in zoning notice

EXTERNAL Email: Do not reply, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's **EMAIL ADDRESS** as legitimate and know the contents are safe.

Dear Commissioners;

I object to this change in zoning because the new zoning permits unlimited height & mixed use with business.

The property in question is the south east corner of A1A to 16th street.

Please don't change zoning in the summer when no one is in residence to object

Joseph Gassib
1610 North Ocean
Unit 1004
Pompano Beach, Florida

Jae Eun Kim

From: Georgia Kouzios <gkouzios@portnet.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2019 10:24 AM
To: Jae Eun Kim
Cc: '1500'
Subject: ZONING

EXTERNAL Email: Do not reply, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender's EMAIL ADDRESS as legitimate and know the contents are safe.

Mr. Mayor and members of the Pompano Beach City Commission:

I/we am/are adding my/our voice(s) to the call to reject the proposed zoning change for 1508 N. Ocean Boulevard, also known as Ocean Park Residences. I was in attendance at the December 2017 Planning and Zoning Board meeting when, based on the Board's staff report and no doubt influenced by the overwhelming opposition of the attendees, the original proposal was unanimously rejected by the members of the Planning and Zoning Board. According to my notes from that meeting, the gist of the review by the Board's staff included:

- Current zoning (RM-45) has a height of 105 feet and 60% lot coverage.
- Requested zoning (PD-I) has a height of over 248 feet and 70% lot coverage.
- The intent of PD-I is to have mixed use buildings and the 400 square feet police substation and 768 square feet of commercial kiosks is not sufficient to qualify as mixed use. Therefore, the PD-I designation is not appropriate.
- The development lacks compatibility with the adjacent city park on the beach.
- Staff also noted errors, inconsistencies and missing information in the request.
- Staff's first recommendation was denial of the request; they noted that if the Board should decide to approve it then additional conditions would need to be addressed.

As I understand it, any developer can resubmit (with or without changes) the request to the Planning and Zoning Board or appeal directly to the City Commission. In the latter (as in this case), the commissioners will vote on the request. If denied that is the end of the process. If accepted, the Commission is required to re-vote a month later – allowing time for public reaction – and can change their votes (or not). If the request is accepted a second time, the zoning for that parcel is changed.

This upcoming meeting raises too many questions:

- What, other than the timing of the request, has changed in the meantime?
- Why is the Planning and Zoning Board and their professional staff not re-examining the modified (if at all) proposal?
- What additional planning and zoning expertise do the members of the City Commission possess? While I realize that it is within city rules and regulations for a developer to appeal directly to the City Commission, I can't help but think that in this case bypassing the Planning and Zoning Board that unanimously denied the proposed change results in terrible optics.
- Why is this meeting being held in the middle of the summer? Does the developer think that the timing will be especially advantageous for him and subject the City Commissioners to less scrutiny? If you approve the request you will be required to revisit it one month later. July and August are the height of the summer vacation season when it is most difficult to assemble a public response. Additionally, as you are well aware many of the home owners in Pompano Beach, and especially in District 1, are part time residents. While they may not be voters, they are certainly tax payers who deserve to be included in such a momentous discussion.

Please do not approve this requested change!

Sincerely,

GEORGIA KOUZIOS GIANNAKOS