

From: peter williams [<mailto:peterpaw@aol.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 9:02 PM

To: Owen Trepanier

Subject: 624 Minkens

Dear sirs,

we own the property at 323 Angela street.

our property is around the corner from 624 Minkens Lane.

we support the original subdivision as it seems to be what the original planners of the city intended.

We have no interest in 624 Minkens Lane, nor do we even know the owner.

it just seems that what is right is right; those that have held real estate through the hard times starting in 2008 should not be penalized for the bad economy.

I give my support to the owners of 624 Minkens Lane in their quest to restore the variance that they had previously received

yours

Peter Williams

From: JT Thompson [<mailto:JT@DesignKW.com>]

Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 12:35 PM

To: Owen Trepanier

Subject: 622-624 Mickens

Thank you for the clarifications, Owen. I wish someone had explained this earlier to save neighbors any misunderstanding! It would be better for density if 622 was not a separate residence, but if 622 will have 5' side setbacks, off street parking and all other Historic District requirements (with no variances), then I will withdraw my concerns. The Butlers are great neighbors and I will be glad to help out any time I can be of assistance in the renovation of 624.

JT Thompson

Art Director



901 Fleming Street

Key West Florida

305-296-3080


jt@designkw.com

RE: 622-624 Mickens Lane

I, Jim R. Biere, reside at 617 Mickens Ln.

I have no objection to the proposal before the City to approve the requested variances for the above referenced properties.

Thank you.

 10/02/15
Signature Date

RE: 622-624 Mickens Lane

I, Darlene M. Bennett, reside at 619 MICKENS Lane

I have no objection to the proposal before the City to approve the requested variances for the above referenced properties.

Thank you.

Darlene M. Bennett OCT. 22 2015
Signature Date

RE: 622-624 Mickens Lane

I, Jane Grannis, reside at 620 Mickens Lane

I have no objection to the proposal before the City to approve the requested variances for the above referenced properties.

Thank you.

Jane Grannis
Signature

Oct 2, 2015
Date

RE: 622-624 Mickens Lane

I, ANTON JONAS, reside at 628 MICKENS LANE

I have no objection to the proposal before the City to approve the requested variances for the above referenced properties.

Thank you.

Anton Jonas
Signature

10-2-13
Date

RE: 622-624 Mickens Lane

I, RATRICIA BLISS, reside at 616 MICKENS LN

I have no objection to the proposal before the City to approve the requested variances for the above referenced properties.

Thank you.

RATRICIA BLISS
Signature

10.6.15
Date

JACK ZORNHEID

Mon 1/18/2016 11:43 AM

Terry Wetmore twetmo@earthlink.net

Re: public hearing on the request for a variance on property located at 622-624 Mickens Lane.

I have signed a statement under duress agreeing to a 2 foot setback. The statement was presented to me by the owner. I wish it to be read into the record that I rescind the signing of that statement. I do not want a change in the lot size and setback size.

This affects me greatly as my house, 620 Mickens Lane, is virtually the property line.

Thank you,

Terry Wetmore
620 Mickens Lane
Key West FL 33040

TO: City of Key West Planning Board
FROM: Jane Grannis
RE: Variance for 622-624 Mickens Lane
DATE: January 18, 2016

I would like to go on record as opposing the variance to reduce the lot size and set back requirements for 622-624 Mickens Lane. I had previously signed a paper saying that I did not object. At the time I signed the paper the lot had had a relator's "For Sale " sign posted on it for a long period of time. I took this to mean that it was a legal sized lot. Our house at 620 Mickens lane is built to the property lines, as is the house at 618 Mickens Lane. Reducing the lot size and set back requirements for 622 Micklens Lane would increase the residential density on what is already a very full little lane.

January 18, 2016

City of Key West

Planning Department

RE: Variance for 622-624 Mickens Lane

I received notice of a variance request by Mr. & Mrs. Butler to split their property into 2 parcels, requiring both a 60% reduction in side setback AND a reduction in minimum lot size.

Mickens Lane is a tiny half-block-long neighborhood. It is already extremely dense, with 10 residential lots and one parking lot, all on 200' of pavement. It's so small, we don't even have sidewalks, because there is no room for them!

Although I support the Butlers expanding their residence in any way they choose into the open portion of that lot, I feel very strongly that splitting that property into 2 lots (making one smaller than the minimum size allowed in the Historic District, and at the same time reducing the easement to only 2') is an extremely unwise move - with no "up side."

First, 9 families currently live on Mickens Lane (soon to be 10, when the property at Mickens & Angela is developed). Each residence has at least one vehicle it needs to park -- and there are only 11 parking spaces total. Mickens Lane is already very dense and maxed out on parking. Adding another residential lot (and at least one more residential vehicle), PLUS having to make that lot even smaller than the minimum size currently allowed, would clearly be detrimental to the character of our Historic District... a quality of life issue.

On top of that, requesting that the 5' easement be dropped to 2' not only leaves the Butlers' neighbors at 620 Mickens Lane with a new residence pressed up within touching distance of their windows, but nobody wants to live that crowded! And a 2' easement could be a potentially disastrous decision, making vital access (like for the fire department or emergency services) difficult, if not impossible. It's easy to see that a 2' easement likely would fill quickly with vegetation and belongings, blocking all access between 620 and 622. Living in a wooden home at 618, I want the fire department and emergency services to have the full, legally required 5' access to all properties on Mickens Lane. It's also a safety issue!

Those of us on Mickens Lane urge you to turn down the request for multiple variances and uphold the minimum lot size and side setback requirements. These building code requirements were instituted for valid reasons... to keep density in the Historic District from becoming unreasonably crowded and to maintain adequate and vital access. Let's not make exceptions to common sense guidelines that would be unwise for the entire neighborhood and would only benefit one property owner's financial interests.

Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration!

James G. Thompson

618 Mickens Lane

Key West, FL 33040