Otto P. Robinson, Jr

Attorney At Law 142 N. Washington Avenue, Suite 701 Scranton, Pennsylvania 18503 570-346-1711 tel 570-346-2651 fax

May 5, 2015

Kim Johnson St. Lucie County Commissioner 2300 Virginia Avenue Fort Pierce, Florida 34982

Dear Commissioner:

The recent actions of the County Commissioners of St. Lucie County and the local Planning Agency/Planning and Zoning Commission prior to that, changing the future land use and map and the zoning of property on North Hutchinson Island on the petition of Ruffin Properties, LLC. contains defects which on the face of the petition, Development Application Forms and the adopting resolutions ordinances render the actions taken invalid as specified in the County's Development Application Form on page 3. The following is quoted verbatim from a footnote on that page which refers to one of the requirements of the form - legal description.

"Only a surveyor, attorney, or title agent is authorized to provide a legal description. The legal description provided on the property appraiser's website is not valid for our purposes. THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION YOU PROVIDE US WILL BE USED IN ALL FUTURE DOCUMENTATION. IF IT IS INCORRECT, IT WILL INVALIDATE THE RESULTS OF ANY HEARINGS." (Emphasis supplied)

The description in Ruffin's Petition and also in the resolutions of the Planning Board and the ordinances and resolutions of the County Commissioner is as follows:

Resolution 15-XXX File No: RZ-820144794 Planner: Britton Wilson

Page 3

A PARCEL OF LAND LYING IN SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 34 SOUTH, RANGE 40 EAST, ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE PLAT OF CORAL COVE BEACH, SECTION ONE, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 11, PAGES 30A AND 30B, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF ST. LUCIE COUNTY FLORIDA; THENCE NORTH 17°03′09" WEST ALONG THE EAST LIMITS OF SAID PLAT, A DISTANCE OF 531.29 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 87°17′28" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 416.21 FEET TO A POINT ON THE MEAN HIGH WATER LINE OF THE ATLANTIC OCEAN AS LOCATED ON DECEMBER 6, 2013; THENCE SOUTH 15°26′33" WEST A DISTANCE OF 46.03 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 04°12′53" EAST A DISTANCE OF 46.28 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 06°36′07" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 44.36 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 12°51′15" EAST: A DISTANCE OF 43.52 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 10°55′28" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 44.36 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 16°33′15" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 45.64 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 31°04′53" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 45.79 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 36°27′02" EAST; A DISTANCE OF 43.53 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 31°07′02" EAST; A DISTANCE OF 45.90 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 16°49′38" EAST; A DISTANCE OF 44.69 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 14°07′38"EAST, A DISTANCE OF 42.79 FEET, THENCE SOUTH 24°49′52" EAST; A DISTANCE OF 49.85 FEET, THENCE LEAVING SAID MEAN HIGHWATER LINE, RUN NORTH 87°17′28" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 405.30 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 11.93 ACRES, MORE OR LESS

Tax ID No.: 1425-701-0206-000-4



10. CHEM. KUAD 7. N. 870 08. 47 W. 146.85 PIERCE 3381.76 5.89°-45'01 554.32 Tr. L. .76.22 585.27 10. Cal. いいから To Co 7: D: 00 SHORES 80 40 Drainage Easement 41.6, 21 --- SProperty Line Utility Easmont U.E. bolow. WARDLE SE BAR STUDIES Street 405 .30 SProperty L \$ Property

I have drawn in red the description in the ordinances and resolutions on the two preceding maps. Please note that the amount of land in the description is 4.436 acres and not 11.93 acres. In addition, the assessor's map and identification number are not valid as a legal description for use in the resolutions and ordinances. Where metes and bounds descriptions are in conflict with area designations in deeds, the metes and bounds descriptions prevail. Please note further that an amount of 5 acres of land are needed for a commercial resort property in the new ordinances. Finally, please note that the deed reference in the petitions refer to a special warranty deed recorded in book 3589 at page 1091 but Exhibit B which is a photocopy of said deed is clearly a quit claim deed. A quit claim deed is generally used when the grantor of the deed is uncertain as to whether or not he has good title to the land and does not warrant that in fact he does have title to the land as opposed to special warranty deed whereby the grantor does warrant title to the property. Please note also that the consideration in said deed as determined by the transfer taxes paid was only ten dollars, and the described parcel lies wholly to seaward of the coastal construction line where no construction is permitted.

Since the results of these hearings are patently invalid anyway, no legal action is necessary to invalidate them. Considering the anticipated size and expenditures in this project, I would recommend you redoing this whole thing rather than having these objections raised after plans, specifications, etc. are already drawn.

Sincerely yours,

Attorney Otto P. Robinson, Jr.

OPR/hir

cc: Ruffin Properties, LLC