

Ryan & Rebecca Hunter-Reay
23 SARANAC ROAD
SEA RANCH LAKES, FLORIDA 33308

February 27, 2025

Village of Sea Ranch Lakes
Sea Ranch Lakes Beach Club
One Gatehouse Road
Sea Ranch Lakes, Florida 33308

Re: 21 Saranac Road Dock Extension to 74.8' and Docking of 69' Yacht Permit Application | Resident Vote

Submitted to the Village of Sea Ranch Lakes Council Meeting 27FEB25

I respectfully request this memo be submitted into the Record of the Minutes of this Council Meeting. Sea Ranch Lakes Beach Club and/or Village of Sea Ranch Lakes are referenced as 'SRL'.

History: We moved our family here in 2016 with the purchase of one of the twenty-eight waterfront homes on the intracoastal (of 215 properties within SRL) and applied for a permit to build a 'finger pier'.

We were specifically required to maintain a minimum of a 15' set back from the mutual property line (inclusive of the beam of the boat) and were prohibited from extending the finger pier West into the waterway more than 40' or docking a boat that extended more than 50' from the 'Wet Seawall'. These are the same criteria that were mandated by SRL of the previous owners of the home (Bascome), and of the previous owner of 36 Minnektonka (Rip Hamilton). These SRL mandates required that we remove a 16' section of our marginal seawall (N/S parallel to the property) so our 42' boat did not exceed the 50' into the waterway mandate.

Currently: In November of 2023 a new resident purchased the adjacent property at 21 Saranac Road and in June of 2024 applied for a permit to extend the existing finger pier to 75', build a 120,000 pound 8-Post Lift and dock a 69' five bedroom (cabins) four bath (heads) yacht which will extend into the waterway approximately 90'.

We have consulted with two real estate professionals experienced with SRL properties and they have advised having a dock, lift and yacht of this size in our sight line is an 'eye sore' and would substantially diminish the value of our property. Moreover, as a decades long experienced boater in my considered opinion the hazard to navigation on the waterway along the VSRL waterway of having a yacht / dock extending into the Intracoastal Waterway 90' is untenable as it is not a matter of IF there will be an incident it is only a matter of WHEN that incident would occur if this permit is approved. There is not a dock anywhere in Broward County along the Intracoastal Waterway anywhere near that length. In fact the existing dock at the applicant property of 46' in length may be the longest.

We became aware of the permit application on January 23rd, via an email that the SRL Code Officer scheduled a meeting on the permit for January 31st, which we attended and advised we are adamantly opposed to the approval of this permit and stated our reasons.

At the Sea Ranch Lakes Beach Club meeting on February 18th President Soto advised the permit application had to be 'approved or disapproved' by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC), that a consultant had been hired to advise SRL and a determination by the ARC would be forthcoming in due course. We appeared at that meeting and formally advised that we are adamantly opposed to the granting of this permit due to incalculable liability to SRL, diminishment of our property value and that SRL had an affirmative obligation to treat all property owners equitably.

Subsequently, we were advised that the ARC had formally advised the applicant that permit was '**disapproved** without an affirmative vote of the shareholders of the Sea Ranch Lakes Beach Club, Inc' (emphasis original). While we are perplexed as to how, or why, once the ARC 'disapproved' the permit it would be put to a vote of residents, as we thought the ARC determination of disapproval was definitive, nonetheless we shall continue to oppose the permit for the following reasons, but not limited to;

- SRL Liability: Why would the residents of SRL accept the burden of unlimited liability for the potential of a law suit being filed against it if, or when, a boat hits a dock/yacht extending 90' into the waterway and there are serious injuries or fatalities. When we were prohibited by SRL from having a dock that extended more than 40,' or a boat that extended more than 50' from the 'wet seawall' liability was one of the reasons stated for the prohibition.
 - While VSRL has a liability policy of one and a half million dollars and the SRLBC undoubtedly has a liability policy in excess of fifty million dollars it is not unreasonable to conclude a single family of four if there were serious injuries or fatalities would claim gross negligence for allowing such a structure into the navigable waterway and file a claim in excess of \$200M.
- Property Preservation: We believe strongly that SRL has an affirmative obligation to protect the value of SRL homeowners properties by adhering to the findings of the ARC and in this instance not allowing a 70' yacht that is tantamount to a five bedroom four bath house to be docked adjacent to our property much less with no restrictions as to charter operations, live-aboards, dock rental, waste water discharge, etc. etc.
- The existing finger pier at the applicant address does not comply with the permit that was issued for its construction and should have failed post construction inspection, required to bring the construction into compliance or apply for a waiver. No such waiver is on file. No NEW additional construction 'extension' of a finger pier that is already not in compliance should be considered.
- SRL specifically required that we maintain a minimum of a 15' set back from the mutual property line (inclusive of the beam of the boat) and were prohibited from extending the finger pier West into the waterway more than 40' or docking a boat that extended more than 50' from the 'Wet Seawall', as was Hamilton. New residents, or residents applying for new permits should be held to the same standards.
- Applicant submitted a certified survey with their permit application that had drawings and measurements that clearly evidenced that the proposed finger pier extension would intersect with and intrude into the mutual extended property line. Once informed of the conflict by the SRL Code Office the applicant had a NEW survey produced that conveniently re-drew the extended property lines so the proposed pier extension did not intrude into the extended property lines, and thereby declared the original survey inaccurate/defective. The original survey was also submitted to the Army Corp of Engineers (ACE). SRL should not adopt the 'new' survey absent particularized evidence of how that new survey came about (did the surveyor simply go into the software and redraw the lines to remove the conflict or was a new survey conducted with surveying instruments shooting new lines). Moreover, we believe SRL has an obligation to notify the ACE the applicant has declared the survey the ACE based their permit approval on as inaccurate / defective.
- We have other objections that we are happy to articulate in writing if given the opportunity.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ryan Hunter-Reay