

October 2, 2025

Valerie Vicente, Esquire
Nabors Giblin & Nickerson
8201 Peters Road, Suite 1000
Plantation, FL 33324

Via Email: vvicente@ngnlaw.com

RE: Robert M. & Barbara G. Tiffany Co. Trs. (Liverpool PUD)
GS 2025-08-22 RZNE-0061-2024

Dear Ms. Vicente:

A hearing on this application was held on September 23, 2025. The applicant requested that the matter be tabled until the October 28, 2025, Board of County Commissioners meeting. There were several reasons for the request. One reason for the request for more time was to provide time to coordinate with the railroad. It is clear that the coordination with the railroad will only take place in response to an application, with an application fee of approximately \$8,300⁰⁰. Based on the commitment to the Board, the applicant is going to file the application with the railroad to determine whether a crossing can occur and if so, what improvements will be required to enable the crossing. The residents requested a meeting with the applicant. The applicant's representatives have been coordinating with the neighbors in an effort to schedule a meeting. The applicant envisions that more than one meeting may be necessary to fully understand and discuss the concerns. There was considerable discussion about the Liverpool Road SR 17 interface. The applicant has reached out to FDOT. It is clear that no definitive information from FDOT will be available by the October 28, 2025 date.

The applicant committed to pursue the issues raised by the Board and the public when the applicant's representative asked for the matter to be tabled. The applicant would like adequate time to obtain the answers to the major questions posed by the public and the Board of County Commissioners and would therefore ask for a six-month continuance to a date certain. The applicant does not want to withdraw the application because the effort they are about to undertake is based on the communication and directives in response to the pending application. The applicant has spent considerable time and money to get to this point. Plus, the applicant continues to spend the \$17,000⁰⁰ a month utility fee. Thus, time is a concern to the applicant. The applicant is asking for the six-month continuance to ensure that there are definitive answers to the issues raised at the hearing.

Your consideration of this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,


Neale Montgomery

NM/llp
cc: Mandy Hines