



TOWN OF HIGHLAND BEACH AGENDA MEMORANDUM

MEETING TYPE: Town Commission Meeting

MEETING DATE: February 7, 2023

SUBMITTED BY: Ingrid Allen, Town Planner, Building Department

SUBJECT: Discussion of Accessory Marine-related Public Input Meetings to include summary and next steps.

SUMMARY:

On December 5th, 7th, and 13th, 2022, the Town held Public Input Meetings regarding proposed changes (“amendment concepts”) to the Accessory Marine Facility and seawall regulations of the Town Code of Ordinances. An identical PowerPoint presentation was presented at each meeting which identified each amendment concept, any corresponding Town Code regulation that may apply to the concept, and a “no action” option. Staff prepared a comment sheet which was available at all three (3) meetings as well as on the Town’s website. Attached are the comment sheets received. In addition to the comment sheets, staff took notes of comments and concerns raised by residents in attendance at each meeting. These meeting comments are provided below by meeting date. The following meeting comment (*in italics*) required some additional research by staff which is provided in the table below:

Look at other municipalities with direct Intracoastal Waterway (ICW), how do they handle encroachment (Comment from December 5th meeting)? **Staff response:** The following table provides regulations applicable to other municipalities:

City	Dock Encroachment	Boat Lift Encroachment
Boca Raton	6 ft for canals and waterways less than 100 ft in width or 8 ft for canals and waterways 100 ft or more in width (exclusive of pilings), measured from the property line, seawall or bulkhead, whichever is nearest to the waterway.	25% of width of canal or waterway or 20 ft , whichever is less. For portions of a boat lift constructed beyond 20 percent of the width of a canal , only wood pilings may be utilized and no part of a boat lift structure shall extend beyond the face of the wood pilings nearest the canal center.

Pompano Beach	5 ft for canals and waterways 50 ft in width or less for canals and waterways more than 50 ft in width, 8 ft (or 10% of width of canal and waterway, whichever is less), as measured from the property line or measurement reference line.	20% of width of canal or waterway or 20 feet, whichever is less, as measured from the property line or measurement reference line.
Delray Beach	5 ft into waterway, if no existing seawall, measured from water's edge at mean low tide; 5 ft if existing or proposed seawall without batter piles, measured from face of seawall; 7 ft if existing or proposed seawall with or without a seawall cap with batter piles, measured from the face of seawall.	20 ft into waterway from the property line or seawall or bulkhead, whichever is nearer to the waterway.

ft = feet

December 5, 2022 (12 residents in attendance, does not include Town Commission or Planning Board members):

1. Look into FEMA preliminary maps, boat lift height should go up not down.
2. Consider seawall height range to accommodate existing (older) structures. For example, Fort Lauderdale has a range from 4 feet to 6 feet.
3. Consider measuring encroachment into the water from existing bulkhead line given some property lines are in the water.
4. Need clear process based on Army Corps of Engineers approval.
5. Support for 10 foot dock setback.
6. Look into provisions for in kind replacement of lifts.
7. Seawall verses property line, consider the one that leaves greater canal space to traverse.
8. Identify properties that may be disadvantaged when measuring encroachment into waterway from property line verses seawall.
9. Datum increase of 1.5 feet, maybe height should be increased by 1.5 feet.
10. Consideration for homes built before change to North American Vertical Datum (NAVD).
11. Support for personal watercraft (PWC) exemption.
12. Support for 10 foot setbacks
13. Byrd Beach property owners reject 25 foot setback.
14. Ladder requirement:
 - should be homeowner's choice.
 - one (1) ladder per waterfront property.

December 7, 2022 (2 residents in attendance, does not include Town Commission or Planning Board members):

1. Facilities located within property line should be allowed.
2. Ladder requirement equals safety.

December 13, 2022 (15 residents in attendance, does not include Town Commission or Planning Board members):

1. Floating docks create conflicts and should be addressed in amendment concepts.
2. Boat lift pilings to have 10-15 feet (30 feet maximum) setback, different than docks and davets.
3. No special exception approval by Planning Board if compliant with proposed concepts.
4. Provide setback for moored boats like Pompano Beach.
5. Proposed amendments to apply to structure as well as boat.
6. Allow accessory marine facilities within the property line, when property line is in the water.
7. Proposed Base Flood Elevation threshold should not apply to nonconforming structures.
8. Have no special exception requirements if proposed thresholds are met.
9. Grandfather existing accessory marine facilities to replace in kind (regardless of setback so long as structure was previously permitted and is not a safety hazard).
10. Reduce speed in Intracoastal Waterway. Speed causing wake issue.
11. Increase in seawall height should be mandated given sea level rise.
12. If accessory marine facility is located within property line and property line is in waterway, it should not need to comply with any proposed encroachment threshold.
13. Make the setback same for single-family and multi-family, not based on lot width.
14. Consider for those developments that wish to replace a continuous dock, that the proposed 10 foot setback would not prevent a continuous dock from being reinstalled.

Note that Staff received a request to present the proposed amendment concepts at the Bel Lido HOA meeting scheduled for February 23, 2023. Therefore, there may be additional public input as a result of this HOA meeting.

Staff is requesting direction from the Commission on whether to provide the proposed changes, in “concept” form, to the Planning Board for review and recommendation or to move forward with this initiative in some other way as prescribed by the Commission.

For reference purposes, a brief history on hearings held (and other related matters) relating to proposed accessory marine facility amendments to the Town Code are provided below:

November 17, 2020 - Town Commission authorized Vice-Mayor Greg Babij to sponsor the review and propose any amendment(s) to the accessory marine structure ordinance provisions (motion carried 5-0).

March 15, 2022 – Town Commission considers introduction to proposed amendment concepts regarding the accessory marine facility provisions of the Town Code. Commission consensus was to establish a process for review of such amendment concepts to include public participation and review by the Planning Board.

April 19, 2022 – Town Commission provides direction in establishing a process for review of amendment concepts as follows:

1. Requests that the Planning Board watch the April 19, 2022 Town Commission discussion on such item (Number 10D).
2. Requests that the Planning Board physically observe the various canal/lot widths and existing accessory marine facilities including boat lifts located within the Town.

3. Create maps of the various waterway widths (including canal and lakes).
4. Once Board site observations are complete, staff is to send out notices to all waterfront property owners (west of State Road A1A) prior to the Planning Board meeting where the Board will discuss proposed amendment concepts as provided to the Town Commission on March 15, 2022.

May 12, 2022 – Planning Board considers the April 19, 2022 direction provided by the Town Commission regarding Board review process for proposed amendments to the Accessory Marine Facility regulations of the Town Code.

May 23-27, 2022 – Individual Board site observations, as noted above, are conducted via the Police Department’s Marine Patrol Unit (for those Board members who do not have access to a boat). Note five (5) of the seven (7) Board members conducted their observations on the Marine Patrol Unit vessel.

June 21, 2022 – Town Commission considers a discussion on a “review timeline” for proposed amendment concepts. Consensus from the Commission was to hold neighborhood meetings at the Town library in an effort to engage input from residents on the proposed changes, and that such meetings commence in October or November upon return of seasonal residents

August 16, 2022 - Town Commission considers a discussion on a “review timeline” for proposed amendment concepts. Consensus from the Commission is to hold three (3) evening meetings in early November 2022.

Note that initial Public Input Meetings were scheduled for November 9th and 10th, and December 7th. Due to Hurricane Nicole, the November 9th and 10th meeting dates were rescheduled to December 5th and 13th.

ATTACHMENTS:

List of Proposed Amendment Concepts.

Comment sheets received.

Sign-in sheets from Public Input Meetings.

RECOMMENDATION:

At the discretion of the Commission.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT CONCEPTS

- Maximum height for AMFs = BFE plus 7 feet.
- Exempt personal watercraft (PWC) lifts from the requirement that “in no case shall the lift be higher than the superstructure of the boat when lifted” OR remove requirement.
- Maximum seawall cap width = 3 feet; maximum seawall cap plus dock width = 8 feet.
- Encroachment into water at 25 feet or 25% of waterway width, whichever is less (measured from the shortest distance adjacent to property line).
- 10-foot side setback for all zoning districts. For lots < 100 feet in width, setback is 10% of width; however, setback cannot be less than 5 feet.
- Require a ladder for every 50 feet of dock.

ADDITIONAL CONCEPT:

- Maximum seawall height.

COMMENT SHEETS RECEIVED

From: thomas.stevens
To: Ingrid.Allen
Subject: AMF Comment sheet submittal
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 2:59:50 PM

AMF Comment Sheet

NAME: Thomas Stevens ADDRESS: 2358 South Ocean Blvd. Highland Beach, Florida EMAIL: Thomasjstevens@hotmail.com

1) Maximum height for Accessory Marine Facilities (AMF) at Base Flood Elevation (BFE) plus 7 feet.

I have no objection to this change.

2) Exempt personal watercraft (PWC) lifts from the requirement that "in no case shall the lift be higher than the superstructure of the boat when lifted" or remove requirement.

No action required. Leave the code as is.

3) Maximum seawall cap width of 3 feet: maximum 8-foot width for seawall cap plus dock.

I have no objection to this change.

4) Encroachment of AMF's and seawalls into water at 25 feet or 25% of waterway width, whichever is less (measured from the shortest distance adjacent to property line)

I respectfully object to any rule allowing a property owner to build any pier, seawall or structure beyond the 8 feet allowed for the seawall cap plus dock. As a waterfront property owner I am well aware the sides of the intercoastal waterway are used by Manatees as a throughfare during their migration north and south. They travel close to the seawalls to avoid being struck by boats. Any encroachment of man made structures will force the manatees to travel further out into the intercoastal where they will be in danger of serious injury or death from boat strikes. The manatees are struggling from a loss of critical habitat caused by human encroachment. I hope our town leaders would prioritize the needs of a struggling species over the whims and desires of some waterfront property owners to build needless structures out into our waterways.

5) 10 foot side setback for all zoning districts. For lots less than 100 feet in width, setback is 10% of width: however, setback cannot be less than 5 feet.

I am against any change shortening the side setbacks from 25 feet. The setbacks as they are now ensure privacy, maintain unimpeded views, and maintain a quality of life that waterfront property owners want.

6) Require a ladder for every 50 feet of dock.

I respectfully object to the addition to the code requiring a ladder every 50 feet for waterfront properties for the following reasons;

Reason 1: this rule will not grant or convey any waterfront property owner a right to install a ladder on their property that they don't already have. Any property owner who wants or feels they need a ladder can have one. There is no rule stopping them from installing a ladder.

Reason 2) It will take away a property owners right to determine if they want a ladder or not. The Town has left the decision up to the waterfront property owner for decades, I see no reason to change it.

Reason 3) The ladder requirement would be a solution to a problem that does not exist. I don't see an epidemic of deaths from falls off docks where the death was directly attributed to the lack of a ladder present.

Reason 4) Other local municipalities of similar size and demographics (ie. Gulfstream and Manalapan) do not require a seawall ladder.

Reason 5) The presence of a ladder will increase a property owners risk of being burglarized by criminals using a boat. The ladder will facilitate easier access to the property via a ladder. My home owners insurance company does not require me to have a ladder, but does require me to have a security alarm system. Why is this? It's because my insurance company knows there is a high probability of my home being burglarized and a very very low probability of someone dying from a fall into the water.

For these reasons I urge the Town of Highland Beach to drop any addition to the code mandating a ladder be required on waterfront properties. Although a well meaning proposal the facts do not support the town mandating this requirement. Allow the waterfront property owners to continue to decide for themselves as they have throughout the towns existence.

7) Maximum seawall height.

Maximum seawall height should be the height of Base Flood Elevation.

The question in regards to giving property owners the ability to replace there seawall by building 3 feet in front of the existing wall should be allowed. It should only be allowed to be done once. A one time exemption only. This should prevent someone gaming the system and repeatedly replacing there seawall so they build further and further out into the water.

Additional Comments:

I regards to the question of where should the town determine seawall placement? Where the existing seawall is located now should be the determinate of all future seawall location placement. If you give Property owners the right to extend out to there underwater property lines you will end up with chaotic, and uneven seawalls projecting out haphazardly throughout the Town.



COMMENT SHEET

1092 Bel Lido Drive

Highland Beach, FL 33487

gregbabie@comcast.net

NAME Paul Gregory Babie

ADDRESS

EMAIL ADDRESS

1. Maximum height for Accessory Marine Facilities (AMF) at Base Flood Elevation (BFE) plus 7 feet.

I support the proposed change. Open to revisions as well, up to even 9 feet. The goal is to stop boats lifted to extreme elevations

2. Exempt personal watercraft (PWC) lifts from the requirement that "in no case shall the lift be higher than the superstructure of the boat when lifted" OR remove requirement.

I support the proposed change

3. Maximum seawall cap width of 3 feet; maximum 8-foot width for seawall cap plus dock.

I support the proposed change

4. Encroachment of AMFs and seawalls into water at 25 feet or 25% of waterway width, whichever is less (measured from the shortest distance adjacent to property line).

I support the proposed change

5. 10 foot side setback for all zoning districts. For lots less than 100 feet in width, setback is 10% of width; however, setback cannot be less than 5 feet.

I support the proposed change

6. Require a ladder for every 50 feet of dock.

I support the proposed change, 1 ladder every 100 feet is ok as well

7. Maximum seawall height.

Defer to Jenkins (Maine Dept), Base Flood Elevation or even BFE + 3 feet.

Additional Comments:

If you prefer, you can email your comment sheet to iallen@highlandbeach.us
THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT...



COMMENT SHEET

David Willens

NAME

2362 South Ocean Blvd

ADDRESS

dwillens65@gmail.com

EMAIL ADDRESS

1. Maximum height for Accessory Marine Facilities (AMF) at Base Flood Elevation (BFE) plus 7 feet.

I support the proposed change.

2. Exempt personal watercraft (PWC) lifts from the requirement that "in no case shall the lift be higher than the superstructure of the boat when lifted" OR remove requirement.

I support the proposed change.

3. Maximum seawall cap width of 3 feet; maximum 8-foot width for seawall cap plus dock.

I support the proposed change.

4. Encroachment of AMFs and seawalls into water at 25 feet or 25% of waterway width, whichever is less (measured from the shortest distance adjacent to property line).

I support the proposed change, except that for properties located directly on the Intracoastal waterway, such encroachment distance should be allowed to a greater extent if and as approved and permitted by the Federal Army Corps of Engineers.

5. 10 foot side setback for all zoning districts. For lots less than 100 feet in width, setback is 10% of width; however, setback cannot be less than 5 feet.

I emphatically support the proposed change. The foremost reason residents buy navigable waterfront properties is marine access/usage, including boating at their home. The current SFR code 25' setback is grossly inconsistent with and much more restrictive than every other local town: ex. Deerfield Beach-5 ft; Gulfstream-5 ft; Boca Raton and Delray-10ft. The code makes absolutely no sense when a SFR with 70' frontage can have a 40' dock vs a SFR with 80' only permits a 30' dock?

6. Require a ladder for every 50 feet of dock.

I think one ladder for every 100 feet of water frontage is sufficient and makes better sense conceptually and from a safety perspective to measure by water frontage rather than dock length.

7. Maximum seawall height.

I would propose to allow seawalls up to a maximum height equal to the then current base flood elevation.

Additional Comments:

~~The dock set back issue is the big issue in my opinion. I live directly on the intracoastal and my property frontage is 80 ft. limiting me to a 30 ft dock. The IC is extremely busy and there are no wake restrictions. Accordingly, without a longer dock and associated "T" dock incorporating a water break design, it is impracticable to dock a boat at my home or even board or access a boat at most times due to boat traffic. A longer dock and water break (as the code amendment is proposed I would be entitled to a 64' dock) would allow a reasonable size vessel to dock within the protected area including to utilize a lift during busy IC use benefitting from reduced wave action at the lift. In fact, I have already obtained Army Corps of Engineers and DEP approval for same but the town Code prohibits my construction permit. This grossly unreasonably restrictive code therefore deprives me of the right to use my property for boating that any reasonable person would expect and materially reduces the value of my property.~~

If you prefer, you can email your comment sheet to iallen@highlandbeach.us

THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT...



COMMENT SHEET

Marthin De Beer

4307 Intracoastal Dr, Highland Beach

mfdebeer@mac.com

NAME

ADDRESS

EMAIL ADDRESS

1. Maximum height for Accessory Marine Facilities (AMF) at Base Flood Elevation (BFE) plus 7 feet.

I support this revision. Based on storm surge on the west coast, you may want to consider raising this further to 9 or 10 feet

2. Exempt personal watercraft (PWC) lifts from the requirement that "in no case shall the lift be higher than the superstructure of the boat when lifted" OR remove requirement.

I support this revision.

3. Maximum seawall cap width of 3 feet; maximum 8-foot width for seawall cap plus dock.

I support this revision.

4. Encroachment of AMFs and seawalls into water at 25 feet or 25% of waterway width, whichever is less (measured from the shortest distance adjacent to property line).

I support this revision

5. 10 foot side setback for all zoning districts. For lots less than 100 feet in width, setback is 10% of width; however, setback cannot be less than 5 feet.

I support this as long as this revision ONLY apply to AMFs and dock extending out from the seawall. As long as this setback does NOT apply to docked vessels, I am supportive. Please ensure this does not modify the current case where vessels can extend to the property line.

6. Require a ladder for every 50 feet of dock.

I support this

7. Maximum seawall height.

Additional Comments:

If you prefer, you can email your comment sheet to iallen@highlandbeach.us
THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT...

From: [Richard Greenwald](#)
To: [Ingrid Allen](#)
Cc: [Jeff Remas](#); [Marshall Labadie](#)
Subject: Marine structures
Date: Thursday, December 15, 2022 12:57:54 PM

Some first thoughts (subject to profound evolution) after public meeting Tuesday. Information presented changed some of my ideas held going in to the meeting. I think the Town was wise to elicit comments and discussion prior to enacting policy.

Easy ones:

1. Each dock, irrespective of length, should have a ladder. This is a life safety requirement.
2. Sea walls must meet new code, heights when reconstructed.
3. New, permanent lifts need to be high enough to get boats out of the water whether that is 7 or 7 1/2 feet.
4. The 25 foot or 25% (whichever is less) measured from the bulkhead (preferred over seawall?) is reasonable. The 8 foot total combined seawall and dock is reasonable. Continuing to artificially enlarge property by extending seawalls over the water is not reasonable.
5. Personal water craft such as jet skis, seadoos or even canoes, kayaks, paddle boards can have (should be encouraged to have) much lower profile lifts.

Harder ones:

1. The fact that “non-permanent” structures such as floating docks, floating lifts can not be regulated by the Town creates a big problem regarding establishing reasonable set backs. With improving technology, lower cost and lack of regulation the use of these items is likely to continue to increase. They have the potential to become increasing hazards and eyesores.

This knowledge has changed my thinking and I am feeling more restrictive regarding permanent structures. I now believe permitting for lifts will need to be configured to individual lots and in regard to neighbors lots. Otherwise conflict can be created.

Note: I find it hard to believe that the Town is powerless and has zero regulatory authority over these often large, imposing but “nonpermanent” structures. Can’t codes be approved based on “safety” or “impingement to forms of navigation e.g. neighbor’s ability to dock”? Would a legal opinion be helpful?

2. Some hypotheticals that occurred to me during the discussions:

A. An owner with 70 feet on the water requests a 50 foot dock. With 25 foot setbacks he could have a 20 foot dock. With 10 foot setbacks 50 feet is ok. At 10% it could be 56 feet long. Anyway, he applies for a 40 foot boat lift for his 45 foot boat. His neighbors on each side (worst case scenario and, I recognize, unlikely to occur) legally have plastic floating docks or lifts extending 15 feet into the water at their property lines. One has 2 jet skis, the other a kayak. No permits were required—maybe fill out a form.

Can our boat owner access his permitted lift? Show me how.

B. A new owner buys that house that now comes with a 40 foot, 8 post lift. The new owner doesn’t have or want a boat. However his southern neighbor wants to install a similar lift for his new 45 foot boat. If granted, neither one may be able to access their lifts. How will that permit process work?

3. The longer setbacks may need to be maintained. PERHAPS LIFT SIZES CAN ONLY BE APPROVED IF THE LIFT CAN BE ACCESSED FROM WATER BEHIND THAT OWNER'S PROPERTY, NOT VIA THEIR NEIGHBORS AREA. But, that is quite restrictive for owners with limited frontage.

Play with the math for different lot sizes, setbacks, lifts and boats and see what you think.

4. I liked the "fit in the box" idea but it is seriously compromised by the use of unregulated impermanent structures. The 25 feet out also compromises neighbors' views if setbacks are reduced from the current standard for single family homes.

5. There needs to be setbacks. One wants owners to enjoy their property but not intrude on others. I like the current 25 foot setbacks and would vote for that while understanding a desire to decrease them. I could possibly be talked into 15 feet. If setbacks are decreased I would favor a "stepped" box to provide less obstructive views for neighbors. I am a big fan of setbacks and protecting neighbor's views but, in fairness, why does a home with more waterfront require bigger setbacks than a smaller lot? What is the rationale for that?

6. I think moored boats should have a setback (3-5 feet?) and not extend to the property line as is allowed currently. Theoretically, neighboring boats can now be "touching". This is a navigational safety issue. Even with whips and spring lines boats can shift position. Even with side thrusters and joy sticks many boaters are less than expert dockers, particularly on windy days.

7. For the Planning Board—they need better definitions of hardship. To me, "I need a variance so I can get a bigger boat" is not a hardship.

First thoughts. Very complicated. Need to think on it some more.

Happy Holidays.

Best to all,

Rick Greenwald
Tranquility Drive (east side of south lake)

Sent from my iPad



COMMENT SHEET

Jeffrey Kleiman

4321 Intracoastal Drive

Jeffreyfl@gmail.com

1084 Bel Lido Drive

NAME

ADDRESS

EMAIL ADDRESS

1. Maximum height for Accessory Marine Facilities (AMF) at Base Flood Elevation (BFE) plus 7 feet.

I support this

2. Exempt personal watercraft (PWC) lifts from the requirement that "in no case shall the lift be higher than the superstructure of the boat when lifted" OR remove requirement.

I support this

3. Maximum seawall cap width of 3 feet; maximum 8-foot width for seawall cap plus dock.

I support this

4. Encroachment of AMFs and seawalls into water at 25 feet or 25% of waterway width, whichever is less (measured from the shortest distance adjacent to property line).

I support this

5. 10 foot side setback for all zoning districts. For lots less than 100 feet in width, setback is 10% of width; however, setback cannot be less than 5 feet.

I support this

6. Require a ladder for every 50 feet of dock.

I support this

7. Maximum seawall height.

I would think that the seawall should be allowed to be as high as a new house ground floor is allowed to be.

Additional Comments:

If you prefer, you can email your comment sheet to iallen@highlandbeach.us
THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT...



COMMENT SHEET

robert spahr

NAME

4225 Tranquility

ADDRESS

rspah50@gmail.com

EMAIL ADDRESS

1. Maximum height for Accessory Marine Facilities (AMF) at Base Flood Elevation (BFE) plus 7 feet.

suggest 8 ft

2. Exempt personal watercraft (PWC) lifts from the requirement that "in no case shall the lift be higher than the superstructure of the boat when lifted" OR remove requirement.

yes

3. Maximum seawall cap width of 3 feet; maximum 8-foot width for seawall cap plus dock.

yes

4. Encroachment of AMFs and seawalls into water at 25 feet or 25% of waterway width, whichever is less (measured from the shortest distance adjacent to property line).

needs some work on wording

5. 10 foot side setback for all zoning districts. For lots less than 100 feet in width, setback is 10% of width; however, setback cannot be less than 5 feet.

Yes

6. Require a ladder for every 50 feet of dock.

One ladder per lot/dock

7. Maximum seawall height.

i dont know

Additional Comments:

**If you prefer, you can email your comment sheet to iallen@highlandbeach.us
THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT...**



SIGN-IN SHEET

AMF Public Input Meeting 12-5-22

NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL	PHONE #
ERIC GOLDBERG	3912 S. DEAN BLVD #1102 Highway 754211	goldberge@gmail	610-2420 613-2420
DAVID STEAN	2901 S OCEAN BLVD #804 #9	dstean1043@aol.com	561 202-3205
Athene Woff Jenny Woff	1005 Russell Dr 4	woffstake@aol.com	561 444-4988
Jordan Gulitz	402. S. Ocean Blvd 3912 Highlan Beach	midasy@aol.com	201 704-0366
ADICK KENNEDY	3914 So Ocean Blvd HB V Por 469	deschner133@sprail.com	848 661 3642
EUGENE GARRETT	1070 Red Lick Dr HB	trunoy@aol.com	561 274.8769
Joseph Loeffler	4318 S DEAN BL	JAY.SEA@verizon.net	431 921 8522
Mark Dutter	7316 S. Dean Blvd.	MOUTER1569@bman.com	Rev 713-205-3894
Thomas Stevens	2358 S Ocean Blvd	ThomasStevens@aol.com	561 563 4975



SIGN-IN SHEET

AMF Public Input Meeting 12-5-22

NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL	PHONE #
KARL ERIC JOHNSON	2358 S. Ocean Blvd	ketmdpe@hotmail.com	561 563 4458 561
Robert Spahr	4225 Tanager Ln	RSBAH50@gmail.com	352 3028
Ted I. Allman	3912 S. Ocean Blvd	ted.allman@gmail.com	919- 264-8607
Kyle MARTINEZ	2860 NE 1651	TomF@AMERICANBAND.com	561 809 8701



SIGN-IN SHEET

AMF Public Input Meeting 12-5-22

NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL	PHONE #
Greg Babij	1092 Belvid Dr	gregbabij@earthlink.net	
David Wilkins	2362 S. Ocean Blvd	d.wilkins65@gmail	
Mike Jenkins	11814 9th St WPB FL	mjenkins@cppl.net	561-377-8213
Maggie Chapplear	1015 BelAir Dr #1	contactmaggiechapplear@gmail.com	571-438 2299



SIGN-IN SHEET

AMF Public Input Meeting **12-7-22**

NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL	PHONE #
FORNBERG	REGENCY HIGHLAND		610-613-2420
① STEVENSON	3420 So OCEAN		617-775-2305
Tom Lohkrogg	4740 S. OCEAN BLVD 206 BRAEMAR		561-236-9194
Lyle Mendelson	3700 S Ocean BLVD #121D	msirm1@gmail.com	561 2514965
MARIA CORTES	4311 S. Ocean Blvd.		713-705-3894



SIGN-IN SHEET

AMF Public Input Meeting **12-13-22**

NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL	PHONE #
Lindsay Trivento	1103 + 1105 Russell Dr.	Lindsay.Trivento@gmail	954 8997889
Marea P Anderson	4201 Tranquility	7	561-901-7684
Jose Andrea	4201 TRAND. DR.		
Lynn & Lee Foeking	1041 Boca Cove Ln	l.foeking@comcast.net	815-791-5532
Robert Evans	3420 So. M Ocean Blvd.	ROBERTAYRELL@ME.COM	917-658-2380
Silvio Blaskovic	118A Highland Beach Dr.	Sailorpa@gmail.com	561-573-4137
Boban Bida	1120 Highland Beach Dr.	C.M.BIDA@comcast.net	561-573-4139
Milena Bida	1120 Highland Beach Dr.	Milena.bida@comcast.net	561-573-4140
Sara Fogner	1083 Belvido Dr.	saraeric@yahoo.com	954 3282737

