

Enid Torregrosa

From: Enid Torregrosa
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 11:09 AM
To: pmginsberg
Cc: Eric Nordback
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] 626 Canfield lane, kw

Hi Peter:

Thank you for your email I will include it under citizens comments. I did not received the original email as my last name was wrongly spelled. Just a quick note that the section of the LDR's you are referring, 122-232 of the Land Development Regulations, is for properties located on the SF (Single Family) zoning district. The property under review is not located on the SF zoning district but on the HHDR (Historic High Density Residential) zoning district.

Please do not hesitate to contact me shall you have any questions.

Best, Enid

From: Eric Nordback <eric.nordback@cityofkeywest-fl.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 5:15 PM
To: Enid Torregrosa <etorregrosa@cityofkeywest-fl.gov>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] 626 Canfield lane, kw

Please see below.

Thank you,

ERIC NORDBACK
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF KEY WEST
1300 WHITE STREET
KEY WEST, FL 33040
(305) 809-3777



From: Ronald Ramsingh <r Ramsingh@cityofkeywest-fl.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 2:06 PM
To: Eric Nordback <eric.nordback@cityofkeywest-fl.gov>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] 626 Canfield lane, kw

Eric,

Regarding HARC tomorrow night.

RONALD J. RAMSINGH
CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF KEY WEST
1300 WHITE STREET
KEY WEST, FL 33040
(305) 809-3770



From: peter ginsberg <pmginsberg@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 1:50 PM
To: etorregrossa@cityofkeywest-fl.gov
Cc: Ronald Ramsingh <rramsingh@cityofkeywest-fl.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 626 Canfield lane, kw

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Enid,

My name is Peter Ginsberg, 619 Canfield lane, Key West. The proposed accessory unit at 626 Canfield lane coming up for approval tomorrow night is, I believe, in conflict with sec 122-232 of the city code regarding accessory units for the following reasons:

1. The new owners do not nor have ever lived at 626 Canfield lane. The current resident is a person who may or may not have been granted a life estate to live there by the deceased former owner.
2. If the unit proposed is permitted, the out of town non-resident owners will then have two rentals without ever having lived on the property. Isn't the reason for the ordinance to prevent this?

I believe that this is against code and should not be permitted. Please advise if, in your view, I am wrong on this.

I look forward to any replies on this matter.

Respectfully,
Peter Ginsberg

Sent from my iPhone