

From: [Kelly Churney](#)
To: [Kathleen Ruderman](#)
Subject: FW: Draft5
Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 5:47:28 PM

It doesn't look like you received this. Sorry if it is a duplicate.

Kelly Churney
Office Assistant III

Town of Palm Beach
Planning, Zoning & Building
360 S. County Rd.
Palm Beach, FL 33480
561-227-6408
561-835-4621 (fax)
www.townofpalmbeach.com

From: Paul Castro
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 1:31 PM
To: Kelly Churney <KChurney@TownofPalmBeach.com>
Subject: Fwd: Draft5

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Town Council <TCouncil@TownofPalmBeach.com>
Date: January 24, 2018 at 13:06:20 EST
To: Bobbie Lindsay <BLindsay@TownofPalmBeach.com>, Danielle Hickox Moore <DMoore@TownofPalmBeach.com>, Gail Coniglio <GConiglio@TownofPalmBeach.com>, Julie Araskog <jaraskog@TownOfPalmBeach.com>, Margaret Zeidman <MZeidman@TownofPalmBeach.com>, Richard Kleid <RKleid@TownofPalmBeach.com>
Cc: Paul Castro <PCastro@TownofPalmBeach.com>
Subject: FW: Draft5

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **Rick Pollock** <rexrmp@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 11:22 AM
Subject: Draft5
To: Rick P <rexrmp@gmail.com>

Dear Mayor and Council,

As a resident of [218 Seaspray Ave.](#), I oppose the Carriage House Club proposal for a special exception use and support staff recommendations against granting approval. I believe that what is happening here is being done without measured consideration and impact.

Congestion and safety on these streets is already an issue that can only be understood by one who lives there. Parking for staff, construction vehicles, beach visitors, The Four Arts and school traffic are a daily battle for the residents. At any given time the race for a space is ongoing.

Parking cannot be considered without acknowledging the impact on the residential geography. Conditions that require individuals to use the valet cannot be enforced. Especially by a governing body such as the Council on a daily basis. It is a fact that some patrons will prefer to park their own cars (due to cost) and they will do so on the adjacent streets. In its application, the applicant referred to "ample parking on the surrounding streets". This simply is not the case. That assumption alone indicates that they too assume that parking on the streets will be available for their Club's needs. Both for the Valet (a for profit private contractor) and for the frugal patron. Private contractors should not benefit monetarily at the discontent and expense of the residents. I cannot see how the Council can allow this to happen. It is an obvious abuse of assumption.

The blocks of Seaspray and Seabreeze Aves. will bear the first streets chosen for people looking to park in proximity to their destination. Public parking has been eliminated several years ago in an agreement made by the town in conjunction with the midtown beach restrooms being built. . Since then, the middle blocks have seen a large increase in parking, and debris left by these parked cars both by beach users and especially by construction vehicles. As a resident it is very difficult to exit one's driveway with so many parked vehicles on the street. Asking the middle blocks now to take on the additional burden of night-time club parking as well as the late hours of proposed operation is preposterous and onerous to the residents of the Sea Streets and Phipps Circle. Because of this, the application cannot meet the town-serving requirement for additional space/seating. This alone should vacate the request as a NO vote!

Regarding conditions to be met for a special use, we find Carriage House to be deficient in many of them has been pointed out in a previous resident's memo of opposition: These are the Town's guidelines. They are already in place. Please adhere to them.

- *Public safety and welfare will be negatively impacted by increased traffic and parking. The town's own staff have commented on this at length and their concerns are backed by an outside consultant's parking study. Additional lunch time traffic and parking on Seaview will put stress on a street that already serves two schools and the town recreation center. Seaspray and Seabreeze will suffer as outlined above, as solely residential streets that are forced to bear the consequences of a commercial intensification at their doorstep.*
- *Property values on the Sea streets will most certainly be negatively impacted.*
- *The intensification of use will not be compatible with adjoining residential development, but rather will hurt it.*
- *There will most certainly be an added burden on municipal police and fire protection services, due to more than doubling the number of seats at 264 S. County. Intensification involving more traffic and more people will always increase the burden on public safety services and is too often overlooked in a municipality's enthusiasm for added tax revenue. The additional expenses almost always outweigh the revenue.*

Approval of this application would also be in direct contravention of goals stated in the Executive Summary (page I-5) of the town's Comprehensive Plan:

"POLICIES REGARDING CHANGE

While many of the Town's concerns regarding growth control originated in a desire to maintain a high quality of life and a small town character, many issues are clearly related to State-wide efforts to curb growth when the facilities needed to serve new development are not available.

The Town recognizes that future development and attendant population growth would aggravate traffic problems, perhaps bringing the Town to a critical level of overuse. The Town has therefore adopted the following policy regarding growth:

To prevent critical and dangerous overuse of its streets, parking resources, public services and facilities, and damage to its historic character and to overall property values of the community, the Town will take all technical and administrative measures legally available, including the use of this Comprehensive Plan, to minimize the change or transition of existing low-density areas or structures to more intensive use patterns, and thereby lower the pattern of density, where possible, and to minimize tourism inflow."
(Emphasis ours.)

Regarding the conditions of operation, we are opposed to increasing the number of seats from 118 to 248 and believe that the town would be far better served by a first floor restaurant at 264 S. County with the same number of seats it had in its prior use. We also are opposed to the hours of

operation, most especially the 2:00 a.m.closing on weekends.

What more needs to be conveyed to the Council that this is enormous concern to the residents in the vicinity. You must vote NO to granting this exception.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Rick Pollock
218 Seaspray Ave

[Click here to Reply or Forward](#)



13.55 GB (90%) of 15 GB used

[Manage](#)

[Terms](#) - [Privacy](#)

Last account activity: 23 minutes ago

[Details](#)